DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 717 TM 023 138

AUTHOR	Joy, Myra F.; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Plan To Revise Special Education in New Jersey. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. Div. of Special Education.
REPORT NO	ETS-RR-91-7
PUB DATE	Feb 91
NOTE	227p.
PUB TYPE	Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Delivery Systems; Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Attitudes; Pilot Projects; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*New Jersey

ABSTRACT

In response to the recommendations of the New Jersey Special Education Study Commission and input from parents, educators, and the general public, the New Jersey Department of Education's Division of Special Education developed "A Plan To Revise Special Education in New Jersey" (1986), commonly called P2R. P2R calls for changes in the focus and process of service delivery, specifying that the instructional needs of students, not etiological or disability label, will be the keystone for service delivery decisions. An integral part of the pilot implementation if P2R was a 3-year evaluation by the Educational Testing Service. This report presents findings of the third year, examining implementation and operations, assistance plan contents, and the impact of the planned changes. Regular and special education staff have found the changes occurring under P2R to be professionally sound and of benefit to students. The largest programmatic change under P2R has been the provision for in-class services, which were found to improve student skills, self-esteem, work habits, and social skills. Parents have generally been well-satisfied with P2R changes. Twelve tables present evaluation findings. Four appendixes contain responses of those surveyed about the changes, survey data, and educator and parent questionnaires. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 717

RESEARCH REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. I. Braun

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AN EVALUATION OF THE PLAN TO REVISE SPECIAL EDUCATION IN NEW JERSEY

FINAL REPORT

Myra F. Joy
Margaret E. Goertz
Randy Elliot Bennett
Margaret R. Hoppe
Ann Gallagher

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey
February 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM023136

AN EVALUATION OF THE PLAN TO REVISE SPECIAL EDUCATION IN NEW JERSEY

FINAL REPORT

Myra F. Joy
Margaret E. Goertz
Randy Elliot Bennett
Margaret R. Hoppe
Ann Gallagher

Prepared for the Division of Special Education
New Jersey Department of Education

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, NJ
August 1990

Copyright ⓒ 1991. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Page

Chapter 1: Introduction

Goals and Major Changes Under P2R 4
Study Methodology 9
Overall Appraisal of P2R. 14

Chapter 2: School Resource Committee

Operation of the School Resource Committees 23
SRC Assistance Plans. 29
Impact of the SRC 33
Overall Appraisal of the SRC. 40

Chapter 3: The Special Education Delivery System

Who is Served Under P2R. 44
The Referral and Assessment Process. 46
Program Structure. 55
In-Class Programs. 58
Impact of P2R on Staffing and Staff Roles and Responsibilities 65
Overall Appraisal of the Special Education Delivery System. 68

Chapter 4: Planning and Training

P2R Planning Activities. 82
P2R Training Activities. 85

Appendix A . . . .

Appendix B . . . .

Appendix C . . . .

Appendix D . . . .

List of Tables

Page

Table 2-1: Number of Referrals to Child Study Team for Initial Evaluation Before and After Advent of P2R. . . . 43

Table 3-1: Number of Classified Special Education Students and as a Percent of Resident Enrollment. 71

Table 3-2: Special Education Students by Classification, 1989-90. 72

Table 3-3: Number and Type of Professionals Involved in All Initial Evaluations Conducted in 1989-90 73

Table 3-4: Number of Classifications Before and After the Advent of P2R. 74

Table 3-5: Number of Declassifications Before and After the Advent of P2R. 75

Table 3-6: Number of Full-time Programs by District for 1989-90. 76

Table 3-7: Number of Full-time and Part-time Programs by District, 1987-88 through 1989-90. 77

Table 3-8: Percent of Students Receiving Different Amounts of Instructional Time in Special Education. 78

Table 3-9: Handicapped Students Receiving Related Services as a Percentage of Those in an Eligibility Category for 1989-90. 79

Table 3-10: Pupil/Team Ratio and Number of Child Study Team Members in Full-time Equivalents for 1989-90. 80

Table 3-11: Percent of Referred Students Receiving Speech/Language Evaluation in 1989-90 by Grade Level. 81

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few years, increasing attention has been directed toward a review of the special education delivery system in New Jersey. In 1982, the New Jersey Special Education Study Commission (often called the Burstein Commission) was created to examine how well services were being delivered to the state's handicapped children. The Commission examined etiological (medical) labeling, the efficacy of special education programs, training and use of personnel, and funding. The Commission's report, The Turning Point: New Directions in Special Education (1985), recommended changes in program options for special education, the role and functions of the child study team, training and development, and the special education funding system.

In response to the Commission's recommendations and additional input from parents, educators, and the general public, the New Jersey Department of Education's Division of Special Education (DSE) developed A Plan to Revise Special Education in New Jersey (1986). This plan, commonly called P2R, calls for changes in the focus and process of special education service delivery. Most notably, students' instructional needs, not etiological or disability label, will form the keystone for all service delivery decisions, from initial identification and referral to evaluation, program planning, placement and monitoring. Students with significant educational problems may receive related services or part-time or full-time special services without disability label. The plan also calls for a closer collaboration between regular and special education. The continuum of educational services will be broadened to more fully support intervention with regular education programs in order to prevent and/or remediate learning difficulties before more extensive special education services become necessary. A new school resource committee, along with consultation from the child study team, will assist in providing assistance through general education programs.

The Division of Special Education also established a special project to plan for implementation of the new state plan. One of their major activities involved implementing pilot projects in 13 local school districts over a three-year period, 1987 through 1990[1]. Although they are not a statistically representative sample of the state's school districts, the districts were chosen by the DSE to represent the variation in district size, socio-economic status, community type, geographic location, grade structure and racial/ethnic composition that is found across all school districts in the state. It was expected that their experiences in implementing P2R would be similar to those in districts with similar characteristics.

An integral part of the pilot project was a three year evaluation by Educational Testing Service (ETS) of the implementation and operation of P2R in these communities. The three-year evaluation of P2R had five major goals:

- To describe ways in which the 13 pilot districts planned for and implemented the programmatic component of P2R and explain variations in district plans and implementation;
- To assess the extent to which pilot districts met the intended programmatic requirements of the new special education plan;
- To identify problems that districts encountered in preparing for and implementing P2R and the causes of these problems, as well as factors that facilitated implementation;

---

[1] The thirteen districts are Belvidere, Bergen County Vocational-Technical, Bernardsville, Elizabeth, Galloway, Harmony, Holmdel, Hope, Manchester, Ocean City, Pennsville, Washington Township (Morris County) and White. The demographic characteristics of these districts are described in Goertz et. al. (1988).

- To evaluate the impact of P2R on students, schools, school and school district staff and the special education delivery system; and
- To recommend ways in which the state can facilitate local preparation for and implementation of P2R on a statewide basis.

The data collection and analysis activities differed by year to reflect different phases of pilot activities. The objectives of the first year of the study were to collect baseline data on the special education delivery system at the district, school, and student level; document initial planning for the implementation of P2R in the pilot districts; and describe state and local training activities to prepare district staff to implement P2R. In the second year of the study, ETS researchers described the P2R planning process in greater detail; the implementation of school resource committees (SRCs) and changes in the operation of special education under P2R; and the impact of the first year of P2R on classified students and on non-classified students with learning problems, on special and regular education programs, and on the interaction of the special and regular education delivery systems. Findings from these two evaluations are reported in Goertz et. al (1988; 1989).

This report presents the findings of the third year evaluation which focused on the operation of P2R in the second year of implementation and its effects on staff and students in the pilot districts. This chapter summarizes the stated goals and the major changes of P2R, reviews the study methodology, and provides an overall appraisal of P2R based on the three evaluations. Chapter 2 examines the operation of the school resource committees, discusses the content of SRC assistance plans and factors affecting the implementation of these plans, and examines the impact of the SRCs on students, teachers, and schools in 1989-90. Chapter 3 focuses on changes in the special education delivery system under P2R, paying particular attention to in-class special education instruction and the referral and assessment system. Chapter 4 summarizes the P2R planning process, identifies effective strategies that facilitated effective planning and implementation of P2R, and describes state and local P2R training activities. Appendix A provides information on the survey respondents in 1989-90. The appendix tables cited in Chapters 2 and 3 of the report are contained in Appendices B and C respectively.

Goals and Major Changes Under P2R

The development of P2R was guided by seven goals (Pilot Handbook for A Plan to Revise Special Education in New Jersey, 1987):

1. The system will assure the protection of all special education rights for pupils and their parents.
2. The system will be understandable to parents.
3. The system will lead to increased consistency across the state in terms of identification of special education pupils.
4. The system will focus on student performance outcomes and student needs.
5. The system can be effectively implemented in diverse district types.
6. The system will facilitate the establishment of effective regular education programs for pupils with learning difficulties.
7. The system will have sufficient flexibility in programming in order to provide special education within the least restrictive environment.

P2R introduces changes that will affect both special and regular education services. The changes called for vary in degree as well as in nature. In some instances P2R requires new ways of operating, such as new eligibility criteria or the creation of school resource committees. In other instances changes are more subtle. For example, there are changes in emphasis to existing practices, such as greater emphasis on the consultative role of child study teams to regular education teachers for non-handicapped students, or changes which make practices more explicit, such as written program descriptions for special education programs. This section briefly describes major categories of change under P2R and the degree to which this change departs from current requirements. A detailed discussion of these changes may be found in the Pilot Handbook.

School Resource Committees

The School Resource Committee (SRC) is a new school-based problem-solving structure created to assist regular education teachers who have students with mild learning or behavior problems who are not handicapped. The SRC is designed to provide services to students "using regular education resources wherever possible, quickly and without the need for extensive testing or labeling." It is an effort to forge a collaborative relationship between special and regular education personnel to assist these students. A building principal or designee chairs the committee which has a minimum of two additional core members. One of the core members must be from the child study team; the other is a representative from a program or service outside of special education.

Child Study Team

The role and responsibilities of child study teams (CST) are broadened under P2R. While CSTs are still responsible for conducting individual pupil assessments, developing and monitoring individualized education programs, and delivering related services, there is a greater emphasis on providing preventive and supportive services to regular education teachers, students or their parents. As part of this change in emphasis, a child study team member will serve on the new school resource committee. The composition of the child study team is also expanded to include the speech and language specialist.

Eligibility

New criteria have been established to determine which students are eligible for special education services and the type of assistance needed. The new eligibility criteria focus on instructional needs and educational impact rather than the medical model of handicapping condition. They consist of six domains--cognitive, communication, learning, physical, sensory and social/emotional--and two educational impact areas: academic achievement and behavior.

The domains and the impact areas specify both standard and functional criteria. A student must meet the eligibility criteria in at least one domain and one impact area to qualify for either full-time or part-time special education services. A student who meets the eligibility criteria for the domains, but does not meet the criteria for educational impact, is eligible only for related services.

Classifications

There are only three classifications under P2R: eligible for related services, eligible for part-time special education services, and eligible for full-time special education services. The classifications refer to the type of services needed rather than a student's "handicapping condition." The eligibility criteria for domains and impact areas are used to determine whether a student needs assistance through special education programs (either part-time or full-time) or assistance only for related services. The decision concerning eligibility for full-time versus part-time programs is based on two considerations: the nature and degree of the student's educational needs and the services provided within each program option to address these needs. Students who require a great deal of specialized instruction and who require special education for a significant portion of their instructional day are placed in full-time programs.

Referral

Referral to the child study team can come from any number of sources. Typically referrals come from instructional personnel or parents. Current and proposed regulations require that under most circumstances intervention efforts shall be provided and documented within regular education prior to formal referral to the child study team. Direct referral can be made to the team for children whose problems are of such magnitude that intervention within regular education is not appropriate or upon parents' request.

Although special education has developed the requirement for intervention activities within regular education prior to CST referral, assistance to regular classroom teachers is inconsistently provided. Under P2R, the school resource committee is designed as a formal, building-level structure that provides intervention assistance using regular education resources whenever possible. The SRC is intended to be a collaborative effort, directed by regular education with membership from both regular and special education programs. It may refer a student to the child study team. Should referral to the team become necessary, the efforts of the school resource committee in pre-referral activities become part of the referral documentation.

Assessment

P2R recommends changes in assessment practices to more specifically focus assessment activities. While assessment under P2R continues to serve two functions, determining eligibility and determining instructional needs, the latter assumes greater emphasis. This change is driven in large part by the new eligibility criteria which emphasize assessment of a pupil's functioning in relation to his/her educational needs. Consistent with this emphasis, P2R requires that child study teams compile and review information about the student's current status from available sources. Additional assessments should then be planned depending upon the nature of the referring problem and the need for additional information to determine a student's instructional needs.

Another change concerns the use of informal assessments. Under existing regulations informal assessments are specified within a description of the assessment responsibilities of individual team members. Under P2R, informal assessments are related to the functional eligibility criteria for each domain and impact area. This change institutionalizes the use of both informal and formal procedures to substantiate student functioning within each area. It also allows greater flexibility in the activities team members assume. Another change reduces the number of mandated assessments by allowing a minimum of two child study team members to conduct initial assessments.

Service Delivery Options

Two primary categories of special education programs are provided under P2R: part-time programs and full-time programs. For part-time programs, P2R expands both the type and location of services which may be provided to handicapped students by special education teachers. Under existing regulations, most students who are receiving special education services for less than two hours are served within "pull-out" resource room programs. These programs may provide only replacement services. Supplemental instruction may be provided, but not within resource room programs. Furthermore, there is no current requirement that a special education teacher provide supplemental instruction.

Consistent with the philosophy of least restrictive environment, as well as the demonstrated needs of handicapped students, P2R permits special education teachers to provide replacement or supportive instruction within the regular education classroom (in an "in-class" program) as well as in a resource center. For students served in the resource center, P2R stipulates that only one subject may be taught during each replacement period. An additional change provides for instruction in part-time programs for up to one-half of the instructional day.

Full-time programs are provided for students requiring instruction within a special class setting for the majority of the student's day. Ten class types have been designated under P2R (e.g., learning disabilities, communication handicap, moderate cognitive handicap, moderate behavior handicap, severe cognitive handicap, etc). Each program must operate according to designated parameters. To facilitate the selection of an appropriate program, districts must develop a class profile for each class type. The class profile specifies the content and methods of instruction as well as mandated related services.

Study Methodology

ETS used a combination of on-site interviews, surveys, and a review of pupil records to collect information in each year of the study.

Interviews

Five researchers from ETS interviewed building and district-level personnel in each of the pilot districts. Each researcher was assigned from one to five pilot districts and was generally responsible for the same site(s) for the three years of the study. The following district and building staff were interviewed over the three years of the project:

- District superintendent (Year 1);
- Assistant superintendent for instruction (or a person holding a comparable position) (Year 1);
- Director of special education (Years 1, 2 and 3)
- Child study team members (Years 1 and 2);
- Person(s) responsible for the Basic Skills Improvement Program (BSIP) and bilingual/ESL program (Year 1);
- Building principals (Years 1 and 2) and guidance counselors (Year 1) in a sample of schools;
- Students (both classified and non-classified) attending classes with in-class special education services (Year 3); and
- The P2R training specialist (Years 1, 2 and 3). (The training specialists were hired by the pilot districts to provide local training and support for P2R activities.)

In the first year, questions focused on how the special education delivery system operated in the district and on the interaction between the special education program, other special needs programs and the regular education program. In the second and third years, questions focused on changes in the roles and responsibilities of the child study team, the referral and assessment process and special education programs under P2R, and on the organization and operation of the school resource committees. In the third year, in those districts where in-class services were provided in grades 7 and up, site visitors also met with a group of 6 to 8 classified and non-classified students who were enrolled in classes where in-class services were provided. Students were asked to describe the type of help they receive from the support teacher in their class and to discuss what they like and dislike about having a support teacher in the classroom and the impact of the support teacher on their schoolwork.

Site visitors used structured interview guides to insure data comparability across districts. Certain topics were discussed with several interviewees to obtain multiple perspectives. Interviews were supplemented by the collection of written policies and procedures and by a review of the training specialists' monthly progress reports and of data reported by the districts to the State Department of Education.

Surveys

The interviews were also supplemented by surveys of teachers, other school staff and parents. The groups who were surveyed and the year(s) in which they received questionnaires are noted below.

- Special education teachers (Years 1, 2 and 3);
- Regular education teachers (Years 1 and 3);
- School resource committee members (Years 2 and 3);
- Classroom teachers who participated in the delivery of in-class special education services--cooperating teachers (Years 2 and 3);
- Staff who requested assistance from the SRCs (Year 3);
- Child study team members (Year 3); and
- Parents (Years 2 and 3)

Surveys of the first six groups were distributed and collected by the training specialist. Completed questionnaires were returned to ETS in sealed envelopes to insure the confidentiality of responses. In the Year 3 evaluation, the response rate for these surveys ranged from a high of 96% for the special education teachers and child study team members to a low of 72% for the "other" classroom teachers. The number of respondents and the response rate for each group are reported in Appendix A. The parent surveys were distributed by the school districts, generally at the time of the IEP interview. Nearly one thousand parent surveys were completed the second year and 1100 parent surveys were completed and included in the third year analysis.

In the first year of the study, the special education survey asked special education teachers questions about their classes, their students, the assistance they sought and received from other staff, and their experiences and opinions about providing services in an in-class setting. The classroom teacher survey asked regular education teachers about the assistance they sought and received from other staff for their mainstreamed students and for non-classified students with learning or behavior problems and their experiences and opinions about having other teachers provide instruction in their classrooms. A third survey form was used to collect information from resource room teachers on the number and type of subjects they teach and on the age or grade span of students enrolled in each period.

In the second year, the resource center teacher survey collected information on the types of services provided to classified students, the extent to which they provided in-class support and/or replacement services, and their experiences with the provision of in-class services. Similar questions were asked of the participating classroom teacher. The SRC members were asked about their experience with SRC meetings; factors that facilitated operation of the SRC and problems they encountered; and their opinion about the SRC and its impact on students and school staff. The parent questionnaire was designed to elicit information on the extent to which P2R increased parents' knowledge of, and satisfaction with, their child's special education program.

In the third year, the Child Study Team members were asked about evaluation and classification activities, their assessment of the utility and soundness of the new eligibility criteria and evaluation requirements, and changes in their roles and responsibilities. The special education teacher survey collected information on how special education teachers used the class profile, their assessment of the impact of P2R on them and on their classes and students, and their experiences with the provision of in-class services. Questions on the in-class program were also asked of the participating classroom teachers. The SRC members and staff who requested assistance from the SRC were asked about their experiences with SRC meetings; factors that facilitated operation of the SRC and problems they encountered; and their opinions about the SRC and its impact on students and school staff. Teachers who did not use the SRC were asked about their satisfaction with other kinds of assistance and reasons why they chose not to access the SRC. The parent questionnaire elicited parents' opinions of P2R and its effect on their child's special education program.

Review of Pupil Records

ETS (Year 1) and the Department of Special Education (Years 2 and 3) collected basic descriptive information on all team-classified students in the pilot districts in 1987-88 through 1989-90. The resulting student-level data base contains each student's school and district code, date of birth, gender, classification, special education program, special education teacher's name, time in instruction, and participation in-class programs. Additional information was collected on newly classified students: domain areas assessed and met, impact areas assessed and met, health evaluations, use of the override clause and SRC use.

The training specialists collected information on all students referred to the SRC for assistance in their districts in 1988-89 and 1989-90. Data included who requested assistance, the nature of the presenting problem, the type of assistance recommended, persons designated to provide the assistance, disposition of the case and the time frame for review and action.

ETS researchers analyzed data from the pilot districts' Special Education Plans and End-of-the-Year reports for 1987-88 through 1989-90.

Data Analysis

We used both quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct within-site and cross-site analyses. Student-level data were aggregated both across the pilot districts and separately for each district. Results of the surveys were aggregated only across districts; the number of survey respondents was too small to permit reliable within district analysis. Site visitors synthesized information from district interviews in written draft case studies prepared as working documents. Taken together, the case studies and quantitative analyses provided the basis for an analysis of the operation and impact of the school resource committees, changes in special education programs and procedures, and an assessment of the effectiveness of P2R.

Overall Appraisal of P2R

Planning for the Implementation of P2R

The first year of the pilot project was devoted to planning for the implementation of P2R. The strategies adopted by districts in the planning activities reflected their organizational structure and culture, resources available to support planning activities and their existing special education administrative procedures.

The process of reconfiguring special education program options and reclassifying special education students went smoothly. Most districts used existing student data to reevaluate student needs in light of the new special education guidelines and reconfigured program options accordingly. The actual reclassification of students flowed naturally out of the program reconfiguration activities and generally occurred as part of the annual IEP meeting. Districts' approaches to revising the special education curriculum reflected the status of the special education curriculum already on the books. Districts that did not have fully developed special education curricula at the beginning of P2R are working to produce a new curriculum, while those with more comprehensive curricula have focused on revising and modifying goals and objectives, adding study skills, etc.

The special education directors, who served as directors of the pilot projects, had a major role in setting policies and procedures for special education programs and services in all of the districts. They were generally assisted in this task by the training specialists. A few district superintendents actively participated in the development of some aspects of policy and/or procedures for P2R. Other superintendents delegated this responsibility, most often to the special education director and/or school principals. The superintendents were particularly helpful when they facilitated planning activities by issuing clear mandates supportive of P2R.

Five types of problems cut across the planning activities and the pilot districts: a lack of time in which to train staff, develop new forms and procedures, review each student's educational needs and to plan to reorganize programs; timing of the planning activities and training; scheduling of people to meet to plan P2R activities and of students and classes to meet P2R requirements; a lack of resources to compensate staff for activities like curriculum development; and insufficient involvement of regular education staff in the planning of P2R activities that would affect them directly, like in-class special education services and the SRC.

Several effective strategies emerged from our study of the pilot districts' planning activities. These included involving all special education personnel, including special education teachers, in the process of reconfiguring special education options; scheduling regular education classes with, or around, special education classes; and using the class profiles as a planning tool to assess student needs, train staff in new classifications and new ways of looking at students and class groupings, and to plan and revise curriculum and materials. Using a committee process that includes both regular and special education personnel to review and revise special education curriculum, design in-class special education services, and design SRC policies and procedures; providing released time or extra compensation for staff involved in the planning activities; and conducting special training sessions for regular classroom teachers also facilitated the planning process.

School Resource Committees

The pilot districts implemented school resource committees in most buildings in a timely fashion and with few problems. District procedures for operating the SRCs generally followed DSE guidelines. Most SRCs are composed of three experienced staff and are usually chaired by the building principal or assistant principal. While SRCs in different districts and different buildings encountered some operating problems, it does not appear that these problems present barriers to access for users. Many committees had difficulty scheduling meetings, but these problems were usually resolved during the school year. A lack of resources to address student needs and a reluctance on the part of some teachers to use the SRC are more intractable problems. SRCs are generally viewed as complementing, rather than duplicating, the functions of other school-based committees or programs that serve students with learning or behavior problems. Pilot district staff feel that the SRC has formalized the consultation that took place informally between teachers or team members about student problems.

Members and users of the SRC were generally pleased with the performance of their committees and felt the SRC process benefitted both students and staff and increased the capacity of regular education to assist students with learning and behavior problems. The SRC process appears to have reduced the number of inappropriate referrals to the child study team and facilitated the provision of appropriate assistance to students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education. Assistance plans generally recommended changes in curriculum and/or instructional approaches, behavior management or modification and teacher consultation with the parent. In a majority of cases, meetings to discuss requests for assistance and to review progress were scheduled in a reasonable time. Gaining the cooperation of parents and the student were the major problems cited in implementing the assistance plans. Cooperation of parents and students, support of building administrators, cooperation of teachers and other school staff and access to other educational programs facilitated the implementation of the plans.

The SRC expanded teachers' abilities to work with students who have learning and behavior problems. The SRC process improved teachers' instructional and behavioral techniques, provided a way for teachers and regular and special education staff to share their expertise, made teachers more aware of the needs of their students, and gave teachers a place to go for support and assistance.

The SRC process also increased the capacity of regular education generally to serve non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems. By the second year of implementation, regular education had taken "ownership" of the SRCs in all but one pilot district. The SRC has made district administrators more aware of needs of students in their buildings and of the need for new and refined programs and services. Several districts have added or expanded programs to address needs identified in SRC assistance plans. Other benefits have included increased communication among staff, providing teachers a place to go for support and assistance, and streamlining interventions for students.

Special Education Delivery System

Both regular and special education staff have found the changes in the special education delivery system under P2R to be professionally sound and of considerable benefit to classified students. Students are evaluated by fewer staff and child study team members use more informal assessment measures and fewer standardized tests. Most child study team members find results from these assessments helpful in making instructional recommendations, classification decisions, and placement decisions. Screenings by school nurses and/or reviews of students' medical histories have replaced comprehensive medical examinations in many cases and generally provide sufficient information for making classification decisions.

The time that team members save by doing less testing is spent consulting with teachers and administrators, on case management, serving on the SRC and doing paperwork. The exception is speech/language specialists whose overall role was expanded. They conducted more evaluations, especially at the kindergarten and primary grades, and spent more time on case management and consultation with teachers and administrators. A sizable minority reported spending less time providing direct services to students.

Child study team members consider the new eligibility criteria to be professionally sound in all of the domain and impact areas. A large majority feel that the criteria facilitate appropriate assessment of students and identify the appropriate students for special education most of the time. Changes from medical to instructionally relevant labels for classification have increased parents' satisfaction with their child's classification and improved communication between parents and school staff. While new labels do not appear to have changed students' self-perceptions or instructional planning, few team members, special education teachers or parents feel that the old classification system was better.

The structure of special education has undergone only modest change under P2R. The number of classifications have remained stable. More students are classified part-time now, due in large part to the additional time allowed for part-time programs under P2R. Districts have increased the number of part-time programs accordingly, but reduced the number of full-time programs only slightly. The new system has not affected the amount of instructional time that students spend in special education. Full-time class groupings are as, or more, homogeneous than before the implementation of P2R and the class structure is generally able to accommodate the diversity of students' instructional needs. Although the names of the full-time programs changed, the instructional focus and content of the classes remained generally the same.

The largest programmatic change under P2R has been the provision of in-class services. More than half of resource center teachers in the pilot districts provide support services in classified students' regular classrooms. In most cases, they serve students who would have been pulled out of class for resource room instruction. District administrators, teachers, parents and students were all generally satisfied with the program and many of the pilot districts plan to expand in-class services next year. Although teachers were concerned about noise and distractions in the classroom, scheduling and lack of consultation time, most of the resource center teachers and classroom teachers were satisfied with their in-class experiences. In-class services improved students' academic skills, self-esteem, work habits and social skills; expanded the services and resources available to students; provided special education students with the same curriculum as non-classified students; and reduced the amount of time that classified students were pulled out of class. A majority of the classified students were able to keep up with their classmates and students were not embarrassed to have the help. Parents were overwhelmingly satisfied with the program.

P2R Training Activities

During the first year of the pilot project, the DSE and local districts conducted training to provide district personnel with the knowledge and/or skills necessary to implement P2R. State training focused on eligibility requirements, assessment, IEP development, consultation, program options, school resource committee and mainstreaming techniques. The general reaction to the quality of the state training was favorable, although attendees expressed concerns about the distances required to attend training, scheduling of training sessions, and conflicts between participating in training and meeting service delivery needs. The DSE required local districts to present an overview of P2R to their administrative staff, instructional staff, child study teams, guidance personnel, school nurses, school board members and parents. Districts were also required to conduct IEP training for child study team members, administrators, instructional staff, principals and parents. Districts varied in the content and format of training as well as the extent to which they met or exceeded state requirements. Factors that influenced training and planning within and among districts included: leadership at the district and building level in support of P2R, conditions within the district, attitudes of regular and special education staff, availability of resources, coordination of services, and ability to provide training in cooperative services, as well as to identify and address training needs with the district.

In the second year of the pilot, training at the local level was delivered on an as needed basis. Training specialists generally acted as facilitators or consultants rather than providing formal training sessions. This role reflected the feeling among many district staff that the training provided in the first year prepared them well to implement P2R and that they needed help with specific implementation problems. The state training sessions on the evlauation plan, assessment, curriculum modification and eligibility, part-time program options, and sessions that included teams of regular and special education personnel were viewed as helpful in the second year. Some respondents, however, felt that the sessions were too theoretical and did not focus on the specific needs of the districts in implementing P2R.

State and local training was much more limited in the third year of the pilot project. Local activities focused primarily on training for new SRC members and new special education teachers and CST members. State training focused on particular aspects of P2R where additional training was needed, such as full-time program curriculum, speech assessments, part-time program options, child study team strategies, and class profiles. Sessions followed a format suggested in the previous year of having small working and discussion groups.

Special education directors and training specialists in the pilot districts identified areas for additional training related to the SRC: problem-solving techniques, including brainstorming; how to function as a group; options to pulling students out of class, and other curriculum modifications; and assessment strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. Several training specialists indicated that regular education teachers needed more training in how to access the SRC, what it is and what can be expected of it. Other training needs included additional training in support of in-class programs and training on formal assessment and selection of instruments for child study team members. Several districts cited the need to involve regular education staff in the training for P2R, and in training regular education teachers to use behavioral and instructional modifications to better serve mainstreamed students. Several districts suggested that training should be on-going rather than a single workshop on a particular topic. Overall, however, most training specialists and directors were generally satisfied with the level of training provided in the pilot project.

CHAPTER 2

SCHOOL RESOURCE COMMITTEE

This chapter describes the operation of the school resource committees (SRC), the types of assistance plans developed and implemented by the SRC, and the impact of the SRC; and presents an overall appraisal of how the SRCs are functioning.

Operation of the School Resource Committees

School Resource Committees were in place and ready to hear their first cases in most schools by October 1988. Members were generally chosen by the principals, in some cases from a list of volunteers. The procedures developed for operating the SRC were fairly consistent across districts and across buildings within districts and reflected the guidelines developed by the DSE. (Goertz et. al., 1989, pp. 37-41) No district reported changing procedures for requesting assistance from the SRC in the 1989-90 academic year, although many modified forms and paperwork and several expanded or changed the composition of the core SRC. One district added the school nurse to the SRC in the primary and intermediate schools and another district assigned CST case managers by school and appointed them as the CST member to the SRC.

Districts differ somewhat, however, in the extent to which parents are involved in the SRC process. Data collected this year show that all districts notify parents before a SRC meeting is scheduled. SRC members reported that their schools used the following procedures for notifying parents in 1989-90: their school notifies a parent before the decision to refer the student to the SRC (61% of SRC members); parents are invited to participate in SRC meetings (35% of SRC members); and parents are invited to participate as observers (11% of SRC members). (Appendix Table B-1). In 12 of the 13 districts, SRC members reported that parents are informed of changes made to their child's program. In most of the districts, some SRC members reported that parents are sent copies of initial assistance plans and/or copies of the follow-up plan.

Composition of the SRC

Most School Resource Committees are composed of three members, generally the building principal, a classroom teacher and a child study team member. The largest committees consist of ten members. In 1989-90, nearly 30% of all SRC members in the pilot districts were teachers, 25% were Child Study Team members and 17% were principals (Appendix Table B-2). Committee members were generally experienced teachers and staff, with an average of nine years in their current position in the school district. Three-quarters had served on a school resource committee the previous year, indicating considerable continuity from one year to the next (Appendix Table B-3).

Sixty-two percent of the SRC members reported that their principal usually chairs the SRC; the other chairs are the principals' designees. The largest single group of designees are assistant principals, reported by 15% of the SRC members. (Appendix Table B-4)

Meetings

Between September 1989 and March 1990 (when members responded to our survey), 46% of the SRC members reported they had attended between five and ten SRC meetings, and another 28% reported they had attended more then ten meetings. (Appendix Table B-5). This frequency of meetings is similar to that reported in 1988-89 for the same seven month period. The SRC members discussed an average of three students at each meeting. Two-thirds of the SRC members indicated they usually met during school hours (Appendix Table B-6) and over half (56%) reported that SRC meetings usually lasted 30-45 minutes.

About 20% of the SRC members indicated that their meetings usually lasted more than one hour (Appendix Table B-7). The hour-long meetings occurred in only five of the 13 districts, and overwhelmingly in the elementary schools.

A large majority (80%) of SRC members reported they had spent one to five hours per month on SRC activities outside of committee meetings. Only 10% had not spent additional time on SRC activities. (Appendix Table B-8).

SRC members generally do not require either class coverage or compensation to attend SRC meetings. Eighty-four percent of the SRC members reported that no coverage is required for them to attend SRC meetings and 75% reported they receive no compensation for attending meetings. Of those who are compensated, most receive money. (Appendix Tables B-9 and B-10.) In contrast, only two-thirds of the staff who requested assistance from the SRC reported they do not require class coverage to attend SRC meetings. The remaining respondents indicated that another teacher (26%) and/or a substitute teacher (21%) covers their class. This difference in the need for class coverage is not surprising since classroom teachers represent 84% of all those who accessed the SRC, but comprise only 29% of the SRC members.

Medical and Health Information

Over half of the SRC members (55%) reported that the medical and health information they receive is sufficient in most or all cases for making SRC decisions. Only 19% felt that the information was sufficient in few or no cases. (Appendix Table B-11) Sixty-two percent indicated that the school nurse is appropriately involved in providing information for most or all SRC decisions, while 23% felt the nurse was appropriately involved in few or no instances. (Appendix Table B-12) The school nurse is a member of at least one SRC in six of the thirteen districts.

Operating Problems

SRC members encountered some operating problems in both the first and second years of implementation. The most frequently cited problem in both years was scheduling, reported by 48% of the SRC members in 1988-89 and, in this year, by 42% of the SRC members (Appendix Table B-13) and by interviewees in four of the ten pilot districts. In one of these four districts, teachers could meet only during the contracted school day, thereby limiting the time available for meetings. In another district, regular classroom teachers have few free periods, so are often unable to attend meetings either as members or as referring teachers. In that district, scheduling conflicts occasionally precluded teachers from attending SRC meetings at which their requests for assistance were discussed.

A lack of needed resources was the second most frequently cited problem in the second year of operation (33% of SRC members). This was an increase over the first year when 23% of the SRC members identified lack of resources as a problem. Two additional operating problems were identified by about one-quarter of the members in both years: insufficient time to review cases and coverage of classes. For example, one district had to cancel SRC meetings when they were unable to obtain substitute teachers.

Although not an operating issue, nearly 40% of the SRC members cited resistance on the part of teachers to request SRC assistance as another problem.

Staff who accessed the SRC were considerably less likely than SRC members to report problems with the SRC process. This may be due to their more infrequent interactions with the SRC or to the fact that SRC members had addressed these problems before they become obvious to staff who accessed the committees. The only problem that was cited by 20% or more of those requesting assistance from the SRC was inadequate follow-up of assistance plans (23%), a problem cited with similar frequency by SRC members. (Appendix Table B-13) Fewer than 20% of those who accessed the SRC cited scheduling meetings or lack of needed resources as problems, although these problems were identified by more than one-third of the SRC members.

These findings suggest that while SRCs in different districts and different buildings have encountered some operating problems, these problems are not inherent in the SRC process.

Resolution of Problems

Schools found solutions to the scheduling problems in both years. In 1989-90, nearly three-quarters of those SRC members who cited scheduling as a problem indicated that this problem was resolved during the year. (Appendix Table B-14) Interviewees in both years reported a number of solutions to the scheduling dilemma in their districts:

- Using a floating teacher or substitute teacher to cover classes
- Creating two SRCs in each building, so members would have to attend fewer meetings
- Scheduling meetings during teacher preparation or duty periods
- Scheduling all SRC meetings in a district at the same time to facilitate coverage of classes
- Limiting the number of teachers on the SRC to avoid scheduling conflicts

The other two most frequently cited problems appear more intractable. Only 20% of those who cited teacher resistance as a problem and 15% of those who cited lack of needed resources reported that these problems were resolved. This finding suggests that operating problems such as scheduling, which can be addressed by administrative action at the building or district level are more easily resolved that those problems that require some change in the behavior or attitudes of individuals or that require budgetary solutions.

Coordination with Other Services

Based on interviews in both years, most districts feel that the SRC does not duplicate the function of any existing committees or mechanisms, such as unit structures in middle schools or student personnel committees at high schools. Some duplication occurred, however, in individual buildings in some districts. For example, the principal of one middle school with a house plan believes that since the house meets and functions for students in much the same way as an SRC the SRC is redundant. Staff in some other schools with a unit structure also did not see the need for an SRC. In general, however, district respondents felt that the SRC has formalized the previously informal consultation that took place between teachers or team members about student problems.

It appears that the SRC has also been successful in coordinating its activities with other service providers, such as counselors, psychologists and remedial education teachers. For example, although SRC and committees on substance abuse may serve the same students, the focus of the latter group was clearly on substance abuse problems. Other resources, such as BSIP, guidance, etc. were generally regarded as programs that the SRC could access to obtain needed services for students. In some cases, the coordination was facilitated by overlapping membership on committees. For example, guidance counselors are members of some SRCs in eight of the 13 districts. In other cases, coordination took place through the principal who generally served on the SRC. At the middle school in one district, however, the responsibilities of the SRC and committee on substance abuse were combined to facilitate coordination, resulting in a ten-member SRC.

SRC Assistance Plans

Source and nature of requests

The pilot districts reviewed 765 requests for assistance in 1989-90, representing about 2.3 percent of the districts' enrollments and an increase of about 90 requests over 1988-89. Of the cases before the SRC in 1989-90, 88% were new cases, 6% were second referrals (e.g., the students were referred in the past, action was ended and then a second request for assistance was initiated) and 5% were continuation of cases from the previous school year. Only 7.5 of the requests came at the secondary level, due possibly to the more limited interaction between students and individual teachers in high schools, the existence of other mechanisms to deal with problems (e.g. guidance counselor, discipline slips, dean, and drug/alcohol abuse programs) and the tendency for academic/learning problems to become more evident in the elementary grades when students begin to learn to read.

Ninety percent of the requests for assistance came from classroom teachers in 1989-90, compared to 75% from classroom teachers in the first year of implementation (Appendix Table B-15). Other requests came from guidance counselors, school principals and vice principals and BSIP teachers. Teachers who accessed the SRC had, on average, 11 years of experience, including an average of 9 years of experience in the pilot district. They reported that they requested assistance for an average of three students.

About 50% of the students referred to the SRC had a history of educational or behavioral problems. This represents a decrease from 60% of the cases in 1988-89. About three-quarters of the students were already receiving other services, such as compensatory education (56%) and/or counseling (15%). Achievement (68%) and behavior (52%) were cited most often as the students' areas of need. Study skills was reported as an area of need in 28% of the cases.

SRC Assistance Plans

Two-thirds of the members of the SRC committees and one-half of the staff seeking assistance from the SRC perceived the primary focus of their SRC assistance plans to be the provision of alternative strategies/mechanisms to the student's classroom teacher (i.e. in-class strategies), as opposed to providing additional services to the student by someone other than the student's classroom teacher (Appendix Table B-16). Analyses of the SRC student records show that the three most frequently recommended types of assistance were modifications in curriculum and/or instructional approaches (28% of the cases), behavior management or modification (28%) and teacher consultation with the parent (21%) (Appendix Table B-17).

One of the features of the SRC model is the participation of the referring teachers in problem-solving and developing and selecting appropriate strategies. SRC members were more likely to report a substantial role for the referring teacher than were the referring teachers. Nearly 60% of SRC members reported that referring teachers participated to a considerable extent in the development and selection of strategies and 35% reported that the teachers participated to some extent. In comparison, only 40% of referring staff reported that they participated in the development and selection of strategies to a considerable extent and 41% to some extent. Nearly one-fifth of the referring staff indicated they did not participate in the development at all compared with 6% of SRC members. (Appendix Table B-18) Few respondents in either group, however, felt that the SRC was only a committee of specialists who provided recommendations to the referring teacher. Most characterized the role of the SRC as primarily a committee engaged in problem-solving activities *with* the referring teacher or *both* a collaborative problem-solving committee and a committee of specialists providing advice to teachers. (Appendix Table B-19).

Problems in Implementing Assistance Plans

SRC members and referring staff cited two major problems in implementing assistance plans: gaining parent cooperation (42% of SRC members and 37% of referring staff) and gaining the cooperation of the student (39% of SRC members and 34% of referring staff). No other problem was cited by a substantial portion of either group. (Appendix Tables B-20 and B-21) Gaining parent and student cooperation were also the problems most frequently cited by the SRC members surveyed last year. Nearly one-half of SRC members identified difficulty in case monitoring as a problem last year. Districts apparently have addressed this problem as it was cited by only 21% of the committee members this year.

Factors Facilitating Assistance Plans

Most of the SRC members (80% or more) identified seven factors they felt facilitated the implementation of assistance plans: cooperation of the classroom teacher who requested assistance; cooperation of other regular classroom teachers· cooperation of other school staff; strong involvement/leadership of the principal and other building administrators; access to other educational programs in the school; cooperation of the student; and effective case monitoring. A large majority of respondents also found the cooperation of parents (76%) and access to programs outside of the school (69%) helpful (Appendix Table B-22). The relatively lower response to getting access to programs outside the school probably reflects the small proportion of SRC assistance plans (10%) that referred students to programs outside the school.

Similarly, a large portion of SRC users responded positively to most of the items listed as facilitating factors. The most frequently reported facilitating factors were familiarity with the alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by the SRC (90%), cooperation of other school staff (85%), and cooperation of other regular classroom teachers (80%). About half of the referring staff reported that training or assistance in how to implement alternative strategies/mechanisms was a facilitating factor. Gaining access to programs outside the school was cited less frequently by SRC users (41%). (Appendix Table B-23)

Timelines and Disposition of Cases

The pilot districts were asked to record the final disposition of the SRC cases in their district as of April 1, 1990. At that time, 36% of the cases remained active and 14% had been resolved through SRC assistance. Thirty-eight percent of the students were referred to the CST for formal evaluation: 26% at the first SRC meeting and 12% at subsequent SRC meetings. In the remaining cases, a change was made in the student's program (5%), the student was referred to an outside agency (2%); the student left the district (3%) or another action was taken (2%) (Appendix Table B-24). The disposition of cases was similar in the first year of SRC operation: 32% were active cases near the end of 1988-89; 18% had been resolved; and 37% were referred to the

Child Study Team. The percent of cases referred directly to the CST (17%) was somewhat lower in the first year, however.

An average of 17 days elapsed between the request for assistance and the initial meeting, down slightly from 19 days in the first year. The initial meeting was held within two weeks of the request for assistance in 57% of the cases. Districts took, on average, another 34 days between the initial meeting and the first review. In half of the cases, the first review occurred within four weeks of the initial meeting (Appendix Table B-25). The average time between the request for assistance and final disposition of the SRC cases was 51 days, or approximately 7 weeks. Although this figure includes the students who were referred directly to the CST at the initial meeting, the data show that half of the cases for students who had assistance plans developed for them were resolved within six weeks.

In both years, the SRCs met, on average, twice for each student referred. In the second year, one meeting was held for 33% of the students, two meetings for 31% of the students, three meetings for 13% of the students and four or more meetings for 11% of the cases.[1]

Impact of the SRC

SRC members in the pilot districts gave their committees generally high marks. Nearly 60% of SRC members said they would rate the overall performance of their SRC this year as very good or excellent; only 16% said they would rate it as fair or poor. This is a more positive evaluation than in the first year of operation when only 48% of the SRC members rated their committees as doing a very good or excellent job and 27% rated them as fair or poor.

---

[1] Data were missing for another 12% of the cases.

Referring staff had a somewhat lower opinion of the SRCs, however: 45% reported they would rate the overall performance of the SRC committee this year as excellent or very good and 30% as fair or poor. (Appendix Table B-26)

SRC members, referring staff, other classroom teachers and child study team members were also asked a series of questions about the impact of the SRC process on them, their schools and their students. This section provides their assessment of the impact of the SRC on referrals to the child study team, teachers' instructional and behavioral techniques, capacity of regular education to serve non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems, and the provision of appropriate assistance for students.

Impact on referrals to the Child Study Team

In nearly all districts the SRC is the primary pre-referral mechanism for special education. Exceptions are for pre-Kindergarten students, parent referral, transfers and emergency situations or severe disabilities. In one district, where the SRC is not functioning well in all buildings, the pre-referral mechanisms appears to be whatever teachers do on their own. Prior to the SRC there was a special education pre-referral mechanism, led by child study team members, that worked well. Many see the poorly functioning SRC in that district as a step backwards. In another district, although the SRC is the pre-referral mechanism and cases are supposed to go through the SRC before the CST, parents are encouraged to go directly to the CST to save time. In the vocational district, the SRC is not the pre-referral mechanism as there are very few referrals at that level and many other mechanisms exist to provide assistance to teachers.

Generally, SRC members, referring staff and child study team members believe the SRC process has reduced the number of inappropriate referrals to

Child Study Team. Three-quarters of the Child Study Team members indicated that they believe the SRC had reduced the number of inappropriate referrals; only 2% felt it had increased the number. (Appendix Table B-27) Eighty percent of SRC members reported that the SRC has helped to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to some or a considerable extent, as did nearly 60% of the referring teachers. Another 25% of the referring teachers responded "I don't know." (Appendix Table B-28)

Directors in five of the ten sites concurred that the SRC process had decreased the number of inappropriate referrals. Two directors indicated that the number of referrals had increased and three were not sure of the impact. In one case where the number of referrals had increased, the change was due to a changing population, which is becoming more disadvantaged and more disabled, and not a result of P2R.

Quantitative data support the perceptions of district staff. As shown in Table 2-1, the average number of referrals in the pilot districts were 12% lower in the first two years of P2R than in the four years preceding P2R. When Elizabeth is excluded from the analysis, the number of referrals dropped 24%, from an average of 46 to 35 per district. These data need to be interpreted within the context of statewide trends which have also shown decreases, although perhaps not as considerable as those detected here.

Several directors indicated that the SRC process increased the time it took for a student to be referred to the CST. In some cases, students are not referred for up to a year while SRC interventions are being tried. Directors also stated that the SRC process produced more accurate referrals, with better documentation of students' problems. They felt that the SRC process had resulted in the consideration and use of a wider range of intervention options and interventions of greater duration.

Impact on teachers' instructional and behavioral techniques

Both referring staff and SRC members believe that the SRC process has improved teachers' instructional and behavioral techniques. Eighteen percent of SRC members indicated that they believe the SRC had increased teachers' repertoire of both instructional and behavioral techniques to a considerable extent and another 63% indicated it had increased teachers' techniques to some extent. Among referring staff, 12% indicated that the process had increased teachers' repertoire of instructional and behavioral techniques to a considerable extent and over half indicated it had increased teachers' instructional techniques to some extent. One-quarter of the referring staff felt, however, that the SRC had no effect on teachers' classroom techniques. Over half of teachers who had not used the SRC also believed that the process had increased teachers' repertoire of instructional and behavioral techniques. (Appendix Table B-29)

Several directors indicated that through the SRC process, teachers are learning new techniques from special education teachers and child study team members and are becoming more aware of the needs of their students. In one district, although the SRC has helped teachers deal more effectively with students who have learning problems, the director indicated it has not helped with behavioral problems. He attributes this to the lack of staff knowledge and skills to handle the new type of students coming into the district. In another district, the director indicated that the SRC has not only increased teachers' repertoire of instructional and behavioral techniques, but has identified areas for future staff training.

Another benefit of the SRC is the increased sharing of expertise among teachers and among regular and special education staff. A substantial portion of all three groups surveyed on this question believe that the SRC process has provided a way for faculty to share their expertise. Most SRC members reported that they believe the SRC has provided a way for teachers to share expertise to a considerable extent (45%) or to some extent (45%). Similarly, 81% of referring staff indicated that the SRC process has facilitated the sharing of expertise to some or to a considerable extent. A majority of the teachers who had not used the SRC also saw this as a benefit. (Appendix Table B-30)

Impact on the capacity of regular education to serve non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems

Again, most of the SRC members indicated that they believe the SRC process has increased the capacity within regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problems to a considerable extent (31%) or to some extent (56%). Nearly three-quarters of the referring staff and 60% of other teachers also indicated that the SRC process had increased regular education capacity. (Appendix Table B-31).

Interviews with district staff over the last two years provided details about how the SRC process has increased the capacity of regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and behavior problems. Three areas of impact were identified: district programs, district administrators and teachers. Several districts added programs directly as a result of the needs of students referred to the SRC: an alternative reading program in two districts, a transitional K-1 program in another district, a homework club, and peer tutoring. Other existing programs were expanded: learning centers and basic skills in one district and expanded time for ESL in another. Several districts developed new materials for classroom teachers. In one instance, an administrator planned new services suggested by assistance needs, but could not get funds. Other districts indicated that services were being examined carefully as a result of the SRC.

The SRC has made district administrators more aware of needs of the students in their buildings and of the need for new and refined programs and services. It helped stimulate discussion among staff about student needs and how these needs should be addressed. In addition, the process helped building principals identify student needs that they did not know existed, or would have previously gone unnoticed because they were not serious enough to warrant child study team consideration (e.g., disaffected youth).

The SRC not only helped teachers deal with individual student problems, but provided an opportunity for professional growth. Nearly 60% of the referring staff reported that the SRC process had increased their capacity to teach non-handicapped students with problems. Over half of the referring staff indicated that the SRC had increased their own repertoire of instructional or behavioral techniques and two-thirds felt that the SRC had provided a way for faculty to share their expertise with them. (Appendix Table B-32). Other benefits cited include:

- increasing communication among regular education, special education and BSIP teachers;
- providing teachers with modifications learned from CST and other special needs staff;
- giving teachers a place to go for support and assistance;
- providing teachers with the opportunities to brainstorm new classroom strategies and techniques and to bring different points of view and areas of expertise to problem-solving;

- making teachers reflect more on what they were doing and how they were handling situations; and
- streamlining interventions for students.

Impact on the provision of appropriate assistance for students

Most of the SRC members (90%) and three-quarters of the referring staff felt that the SRC process facilitated the provision of assistance for students with learning and behavior problems. (Appendix Tables B-33 and B-32). This assistance benefitted a wide range of students. Forty-four percent of the referring staff requested assistance for pupils they would not have considered sending to the CST. They reported they requested assistance for an average of two such students. The referring staff, SRC members and other teachers all felt that the SRC process benefitted this group of students. Eighty-four percent of the SRC members, 70% of the referring staff and 53% of teachers who had not used the SRC indicated the SRC had helped to serve students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education. (Appendix Table B-34)

A large majority of teachers who used the SRC (64%) and of teachers who did not access the SRC (70%) feel that they are meeting the needs of their non-classified students with learning or behavior problems moderately or very well. About 70% of both groups are satisfied with the assistance they received for these students this year. These teachers are considerably more satisfied with this assistance than were teachers in the year before P2R was implemented. (Appendix Tables B-35 and B-36)

Nearly all the referring staff reported that prior to the SRC they would have sought assistance for students with learning and/or behavior problems from other staff in their school or district. Only 4% indicated that they did not seek such assistance. A majority indicated they would have sought assistance for students with learning and behavior problems from the building principal or assistant principal, child study team members, and other classroom teachers. Basic skills teachers were an additional source of help for students with learning problems. (Appendix Table B-37) Nearly half of the referring teachers feel, however, that they are meeting the needs of their non-classified students with learning and behavior problems better now than when their school did not have an SRC. (Appendix Table B-38)

Most of the teachers who did not use the SRC reported that they did not seek assistance because they had no students who required this type of assistance (50%) or other sources of assistance were available (18%). No one indicated that they avoided the SRC because others would think them a poor teacher. Other reasons cited for not using the SRC were lack of familiarity with the process (10%) and the time it took to get assistance (10%). (Appendix Table B-39)

Overall Appraisal of the SRC

The pilot districts implemented school resource committees in most buildings in a timely fashion and with few problems. District procedures for operating the SRCs generally followed DSE guidelines. Most SRCs are composed of three experienced staff and are usually chaired by the building principal or assistant principal. While SRCs in different districts and different buildings encountered some operating problems, it does not appear that these problems present barriers to access for users. Many committees had difficulty scheduling meetings, but these problems were usually resolved during the school year. A lack of resources to address student needs and a reluctance on the part of some teachers to use the SRC are more intractable problems. SRCs are generally viewed as complementing, rather than duplicating, the functions of other school-based committees or programs that serve students with learning or behavior problems. Pilot district staff feel that the SRC has formalized the consultation that took place informally between teachers or team members about student problems.

Members and users of the SRC were generally pleased with the performance of their committees and felt the SRC process benefitted both students and staff and increased the capacity of regular education to assist students with learning and behavior problems. The SRC process appears to have reduced the number of inappropriate referrals to the child study team and facilitated the provision of appropriate assistance to students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education. Assistance plans generally recommended changes in curriculum and/or instructional approaches, behavior management or modification and teacher consultation with the parent. In a majority of cases, meetings to discuss requests for assistance and to review progress were scheduled in a reasonable time. Gaining the cooperation of parents and the student were the major problems cited in implementing the assistance plans. Cooperation of parents and students, support of building administrators, cooperation of teachers and other school staff and access to other educational programs facilitated the implementation of the plans.

The SRC expanded teachers' abilities to work with students who have learning and behavior problems. The SRC process improved teachers' instructional and behavioral techniques, provided a way for teachers and regular and special education staff to share their expertise, made teachers more aware of the needs of their students, and gave teachers a place to go for support and assistance.

The SRC process also increased the capacity of regular education generally to serve non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems. By the second year of implementation, regular education had taken "ownership" of the SRCs in all but one pilot district. The SRC has made district administrators more aware of needs of students in their buildings and of the need for new and refined programs and services. Several districts have added or expanded programs to address needs identified in SRC assistance plans. Other benefits have included increased communication among staff, providing teachers a place to go for support and assistance. and streamlining interventions for students.

District administrators were asked to reflect on the future of the SRCs in their schools. Most indicated that the SRCs would continue, although in several districts, the future of the SRC will vary by building. Some buildings had institutionalized the process and some had not The SRCs are most likely to continue in districts where there is commitment and support from the central administration and in those schools where there is commitment and leadership from the principal. SRCs appear to be less needed in the county vocational district because as in other secondary schools, there are many other well-established mechanisms to deal with these problems. Students are in the satellite schools only half a day and many learning and behavior problems disappear when students are in shop classes, which they enjoy.

Table 2-1

Number of Referrals to Child Study Team for Initial Evaluation

Before and After Advent of P2R

District	Average for Years 1984-85 through 1987-88	Average for Years 1988-89 through 1989-90	1988-89 only	1989-90 only
Belvidere	39	20	19	20
Harmony	20	10	10	10
Hope	9	9	9	9
White	15	9	9	8
Bergen Voc	2*	3	2	3
Bernardsville	57	20	15	25
Elizabeth	315	342	243	440
Galloway	44	55	39	71
Holmdel	64	35	35	35
Manchester	66	47	56	38
Ocean City	54	66	65	66
Pennsville	58**	40	30	49
Washington Twp	82	71	70	71
Average for Pilot ***	69	61	50	70
Pilot Average without Elizabeth ***	46	35	33	37

Note: Numbers do not include students referred for speech problems. Average taken over all districts is based only on districts with data for at least three of the four years, 1984-87.

* Data were available for one of four years.
** Data were available for three of four years.
*** Excludes Bergen Vocational Technical

Source: Pilot district data from End of the Year Reports, Table 1, 1984-85 through 1989-90.

CHAPTER 3

THE SPECIAL EDUCATION DELIVERY SYSTEM

This chapter provides an overview of the special education delivery system under P2R: the characteristics of students served; the referral and assessment process; program structure; the in-class program; and the impact of P2R on staffing and staff roles and responsibilities.

Who is Served Under P2R?

Table 3-1 presents the number of resident classified students for 1989-90 and 1988-89 and these students as a percentage of resident enrollment for the years 1987-88 through 1989-90. In 1989-90, 4,822 public and non-public school students were classified special education students in the 13 pilot districts, representing 14.6% of the resident student population. Both the number and percentage of special education students in the pilot districts decreased over the three year period. The number of classified students declined by 360, or 6.9%, while the percent of enrolled students who were classified dropped by 1.4 percentage points. The decline in the percent of classified students was steady: 0.5 percentage points in the first year of P2R and 0.9 percentage points in the second year of the program.

These total figures mask variation across the districts, however. The percent of students receiving special education in 1989-90 ranged from a low of 7% in Holmdel to a high of 21% in Belvidere. Three of the districts had a four or more percentage point decrease in the percent of special education students served between 1987-88 and 1989-90, six had a one to two percentage point decrease, one remained stable and three showed an increase in the percent served. Four districts showed a steady decline in the percent of classified students during the first two years of P2R--Belvidere, Galloway, Manchester and Washington Township. In another four districts (Hope, Bernardsville, Elizabeth and Holmdel) most of the decline occurred in the first year.

Insert Table 3-1 here

Table 3-2 shows how the special education students were classified under P2R. Looking across the pilot districts, about 61% of the special education students are classified as needing full-time services, about 38% as needing part-time services and less than two percent as needing related services only (not including eligible for speech only). In 1988-89, slightly fewer students were classified as full-time (59%). As P2R uses a new classification scheme, one cannot directly compare student classifications to those that pre-date P2R. One rough comparison can be made, however, by comparing P2R classifications (full-time and part-time) with special education placements under the old system (resource room, self-contained and out-of-district). In 1987-88, about 60% of the students in all of the pilot districts except Elizabeth[1] were in self-contained or out-of-district placements and generally received special education services more than half of the school day (Goertz et. al, 1988, Tables B-3 and B-7). This compares with 53% of the students who were classified as full-time this year when Elizabeth is excluded from the analysis. Another 35% were placed in resource rooms in 1987-88, compared to 46% of the students who were classified as part-time special education students in 1989-90 (excluding Elizabeth). Thus it appears that a larger portion of students are classified as needing part-time services under P2R than in the past.

---

[1] Complete data were not available for Elizabeth that year.

Insert Table 3-2 here

The Referral and Assessment Process

The number of referrals to the child study team in the first two years of P2R are shown in Table 2-1 along with the average number of referrals for the previous four years. Referrals for the first year of P2R implementation (1988-89) decreased by 28% across the pilot districts in contrast with a 16% drop statewide. When the data for the individual districts are examined, only three districts (Ocean City, Hope, and Bergen) failed to show a decrease. In the second year of implementation, the average number of referrals increased by 30 percent, to a number approaching the pre-P2R average. This change is due to an 81% increase in referrals in Elizabeth. The number of referrals in eight other pilot districts remained stable between 1988-89 and 1989-90, decreased in one district and increased in three districts. As noted in Chapter 2, when Elizabeth is excluded from the analysis, the average number of referrals dropped 24% over the two-year period.

Evaluation

Table 3-3 gives the number and type of professionals involved in the initial evaluation. As can be seen, psychologists were most frequently involved in evaluations, followed by learning consultants, and then social workers and speech therapists. Psychologists and learning consultants were involved in about 85% of the evaluations, while the social workers and speech therapists were involved in about 40% of the cases. Physicians participated in about 20% of the evaluations, but their involvement ranged considerably across the districts from 3% of evaluations in Galloway to more than 60% of evaluations in Washington Township. The involvement of the social worker and speech-language specialist also varied across districts.

Insert Table 3-3 here

In most districts, child study team members and special education administrators interviewed in the first year of P2R perceived the number of team members involved in initial evaluation and re-evaluation not to have changed: initial evaluations were said to typically employ 3-4 professionals and re-evaluations to involve two members. In a minority of districts, fewer individuals were reported as being used on initial evaluation and re-evaluation. In those situations in which an evaluation team member was omitted, it was often because the parent interview was conducted by the learning consultant or psychologist rather than by the social worker. The data in Table 3-3 show that an average of 2.7 individuals were involved in initial evaluations in 1989-90 suggesting that, over all districts, the number of team members conducting initial evaluations declined.

The content of assessment clearly has changed as well. Child study team members increased their use of informal--termed "functional" in P2R parlance--measures (e.g., observation, records review, review of documented accomplishments, criterion-referenced tests) to satisfy functional criteria, and reduced use in several categories of formal--or "standard"--testing. Nearly 60% of child study team members reported an increase in classroom observation, and 40% reported a more frequent use of records review. About one-third of the team members use skills inventories and review of work samples more often. Parent interviews were used more frequently by a substantial portion of all team members except social workers, who now use them somewhat less frequently, since other team members can conduct the parent interviews. Overall 25% of team members reported an increase in the use of parent interviews. (Appendix Table C-1)

While there was no noticeable change in the use of standardized achievement tests, child study team members used both I.Q. tests and perceptual motor tests considerably less often. Fifty-four percent of psychologists reported that they use I.Q. tests less frequently and 74% of the L.D.T.C. and 56% of psychologists reported making less use of perceptual motor tests. About one-third of the speech language specialists reported using speech or language tests more often. (Appendix Table C-1).

Child study team members view changes in evaluation procedures favorably. Over half found that the results of functional assessments were very helpful in making instructional recommendations, classification decisions and placement decisions. Fewer than 10% felt that they were not helpful at all. (Appendix Table C-2) A large majority of special education teachers reported that the CST reports are about as helpful as before P2R. About one-third of the teachers indicated that the reports are more helpful in understanding the characteristics of students and nearly one-quarter said they are more helpful in deciding what to teach and how to teach it. (Appendix Table C-3).

Prior to P2R, a medical examination was performed for each child referred for evaluation. Under P2R, such exams are not required for all students. As a result, evaluations are now more likely to include a screening by the school nurse and/or a review of medical history than a full comprehensive medical exam. Only one-quarter of the CST members reported that a comprehensive medical exam is included in most or all evaluations. Seventy percent reported the school nurse conducted a screening in all or most of the cases, and 65% reported that a review of the medical history was conducted all or most of the time. Only 3% reported that no medical information was available in all or most cases. (Appendix Table C-4)

Although most evaluations are not using a comprehensive medical exam, more than half of the CST members (61%) reported that the medical information provided is sufficient to arrive at a classification decision in all or most cases; 27% felt that the information is sufficient in only a few or no cases. Nearly half (48%) felt that the school nurse was appropriately involved in all or most cases and 30% felt that the nurse was appropriately involved in only a few or no cases. (Appendix Tables C-5 and C-6)

Eligibility criteria and classification

The evaluation process is intended to produce the information needed for making a classification decision and program determination. Seventy-three percent of CST members reported that the eligibility criteria facilitate appropriate assessment all or most of the time. A similar percentage felt that the criteria identified the appropriate students for special education all or most of the time. Nearly all of the CST members felt that the eligibility criteria are professionally sound in all of the domain and impact areas. (Appendix Tables C-7 through C-9).

Last year, interviewees perceived the major benefit of the new criteria as increasing the objectivity and consistency of the classification process. The majority of child study team members (54%) surveyed this year indicated that the new classification is more consistent in classifying students the same way, regardless of who does the evaluation. Only 14% felt that students are less likely to receive the same classification from two different child study teams in their district under P2R. (Appendix Table C-10).

Directors and training specialists in all the pilot districts indicated that CST members had a fairly good understanding of the criteria, although in some cases there was a tendency to revert to the former types of assessments. One director, however, indicated that staff had made such a total transition to the new system that she did not think they could go back to the old ways of doing evaluations. Interviewees in several districts indicated that staff still have some difficulty with the social-emotional domain, pre-school assessments, and functional assessments.

If a student does not meet the standard criteria in a domain or impact area, but the child study team and parent believe that the pupil is handicapped, the pupil may be determined eligible for services with an override. Districts used the override provision sparingly this year, in only 37 of 591, or six percent, of the cases. The override was used only for the learning domain. Several districts indicated that they have no policy about using the override, but decide on a case by case basis.

Although the number of referrals dropped under P2R, the number of classifications remained stable. Table 3-4 shows the average number of classifications for the four years before the advent of P2R as contrasted with the number of new classifications in the 1988-89 and 1989-90 school years. Between these two periods no measurable change in classifications occurred, on average, across the pilot districts, although some districts saw considerable increases or decreases in classifications.

Insert Table 3-4 here

As a consequence of decreasing referral and stable classification figures, the rate of classification (the number classified divided by the number referred) rose in the first two years of P2R. The average classification rate over the four previous years was 62% (similar to the statewide average of 59%). During the first two years of P2R, the rate rose to 71% across the pilot districts. When Elizabeth is excluded from the analysis, the classification rate shows an even larger increase from 52% to 71%. One plausible interpretation, supported by the survey data presented in Chapter 2, is that more of those referred under P2R are in need of special education than in past years because of the role of the SRC in reducing unnecessary referrals.

In Table 3-5 are presented the number of students declassified before and after the advent of P2R. For the four years prior to P2R, there is a fair amount of missing data, so only tentative inferences can be drawn. As presented, the data suggest a negligible decrease in declassifications in the first two years of P2R.

Insert Table 3-5 here

In general, most CST members did not perceive a significant change in the severity of problems for students referred or classified under P2R. Over 60% of child study team members felt that students referred to the CST and classified now are generally similar to those referred and classified prior to P2R in the severity of their problems. About one-third felt that students referred and classified now evidence more severe problems than those referred and classified prior to P2R. (Appendix Tables C-11 and C-12)

A major change under P2R is the use of program classifications rather than disability labels for students. In interviews, all directors indicated that the change to a program-driven labeling system was a very positive aspect of P2R. They indicated that parents liked the change and that this system kept the focus on the students' needs, rather than their disabilities. One disadvantage cited by directors in two districts was that in a departmentalized program, there is very little difference between full-time and part-time classifications.

We asked both Child Study Team members and special education teachers how they perceived the impact of this change in labeling on students, parents, staff and instructional planning. The overall assessment, reported in Appendix Tables C-13 and C-14, was generally positive. The overwhelming majority of CST members (88%) and 63% of special education teachers felt that this change had a positive impact on parents' satisfaction with their child's classification. Eighty percent of child study team members and 33% of special education teachers felt that it had a positive impact on communication with parents. Few, if any, staff reported the labeling changes had a negative impact on parents.

The majority of respondents felt the new labels had not changed their relations with regular education staff, students' self-perceptions, special education morale, instructional planning and the education of handicapped students. However, a sizeable minority (30% to 40%) of both child study team members and special education teachers felt that the change in labeling had had a positive impact in each of these areas.

Parents of classified students were also asked their opinion of the new classification system. A majority of the parents who said their children were classified under the old system felt that the current method of classifying students by program type is better (55%), the new classification system has improved their communication with school staff (54%), and increased their child's self-esteem (53%). A small minority indicated that the old classification system was better (7%), the new system had not improved communications with their child's school (28%) or had not made their child feel better about him/herself (20%). (Appendix Tables C-15 through C-17)

Placement and the use of class profiles

Upon classification, child study team members make a placement recommendation. The appropriateness of this recommendation is in large part determined by the teams' familiarity with the available program options and the individual classes that compose those options. Under P2R, a class profile was introduced to facilitate development of this familiarity. The profiles are designed to include descriptions of the students served, special instructional needs, strategies and methods, curriculum and equipment, as well as class size and age ranges. The descriptions also state when particular related services are mandatory and when they are optional. Class profiles are to be used to select the most appropriate class type for each student.

All the pilot districts prepared profiles for full-time classes (and some for part-time classes) and directors, child study team members, special education teachers and parents find them generally helpful. The overwhelming majority of special education teachers (86%) indicated that a class profile had been prepared for their class(es). In most districts, the profiles are revised once a year, usually by the special education teacher (69%). A substantial portion of child study team members (49%), training specialists (46%) and special education administrators (42%) were also involved in revising the class profiles. (Appendix Tables C-18 and C-19) Where profiles were not updated at least annually, it was because there were no changes in the classes. In one case they were updated two times a year; once in January, based on projections and again in May or June with the actual data. One district indicated they updated the profiles as needed.

A majority of child study team members (58%) reported that they use class profiles to make placement decisions at least some of the time. Of the child study team members who do not use them, over half indicated it was because they knew the characteristics of their full-time classes very well. (Appendix Tables C-20 and C-21) At least three-quarters of the team members found all components of the profiles to be of some or considerable value. The components that were reported by nearly all the respondents to be of value were the program description; curriculum areas/levels; actual class size and age span; required method of instructional delivery; and specialized services. Relatively fewer child study team members (75%) reported the component on teacher certification to be of value (Appendix Table C-22). All of the directors interviewed in the pilot districts and over three-quarters of child study team members surveyed indicated profiles would help directors make decisions about placing their students in out-of-district programs. (Appendix Table C-23)

Nearly all special education teachers found the profiles useful to some or a considerable extent in understanding the characteristics of their students; clarifying the general goals of their program; understanding the skill levels of their groups; understanding the method of instructional delivery; understanding required related services and specialized services; and developing curricula for their classes. Most teachers also found them useful for planning and selecting instructional activities, developing curricula and explaining the program to parents. (Appendix Table C-24).

Most districts use the profiles to explain special education programs to parents at the annual review. About 60% of the parents who indicated their child was in a full-time program reported seeing a class profile. Nearly all of those parents who saw a class profile found it very appropriate (67%) or somewhat appropriate (23%) and 80% indicated that their child was receiving all the services listed on the profile. (Appendix Tables C-25 through C-27)

Directors in six of the districts reported that the class profiles also affected special education curriculum. In some cases, curriculum was revised and/or services added to meet the requirements in the profile. In one district, the profile had a major impact on planning a new program. Several districts indicated that the profiles helped teams and teachers focus on curriculum and better differentiate between class types. In one district, the director indicated that the preparation of the profiles increased collegiality among those preparing them.

Program Structure

The pilot districts use five of the ten program types permitted under P2R: learning disability, moderate cognitive, moderate behavior, communication handicap and preschool handicap[2]. As shown in Table 3-6, the pilot districts ran 192 full-time special education classes in 1989-90. The largest number of classes are allocated to learning disability (121). All districts with full-time classes had learning disability classes. The next most frequent class type was moderate cognitive (31), which appeared in half of the districts.

Between 1987-88 and 1989-90, the pilot districts added a net of 27 full-time classes. Most of the growth was in Bergen County Vocational-Technical which added 35 full-time classes. Five of the other pilot districts added a small number of full-time classes, usually to accommodate changes in the population or a group of students who were moving from one school to another or to bring back students from out of district. Three of the districts closed full-time classes. In two of these districts, interviewees indicated that students from these classes are now being served in part-time programs. The third district had more space for full-time LD students than needed. The number of part-time programs increased from 88 to 125 (Table 3-7).

---

[2] The types that were not used by any district are: severe behavior, severe physical, severe cognitive, auditory, and auditory-visual.

Insert Tables 3-6 and 3-7 here

Two districts reported shifts of students both from full-time to part-time and part-time to full time classes. The director in one of those districts indicated that there was a greater shift of students within full-time programs, where original placements were not suitable. Four districts moved students from full-time to part-time due to more time allowed under P2R. In one of these districts, the director has mandated more part-time programs.

Table 3-8 shows the percentage of students receiving different amounts of time in special education. The data are essentially unchanged from 1988-89 and 1987-88. Nearly all part-time students are in special education for less than half of the instructional day: 38% of the students for less than 25 percent of the time and 51% for 25 to 50 percent of the time. Ninety-eight percent of the full-time students are in special education for 50% or more of the time with more than half of the students receiving special education instruction for at least 90% of the instructional day.

Insert Table 3-8 here

Data on the percentage of classified students receiving related services is presented in Table 3-9. Percentages are based on the number of students within particular program types (i.e., full-time, part-time, eligible for related services). The most frequently provided related services for full-time students are speech/language therapy (40%), and counseling (33%). Fewer part-time students receive related services, but those who do receive counseling (15%) and speech/language therapy (13%). The percentages of students receiving speech/language services is relatively unchanged from either 1988-89 or 1987-88. The percentage of full-time students receiving counseling this year increased ten percentage points, while the percentage of part-time students receiving this service decreased by 13 percentage points from the two prior years.

Insert Table 3-9 here

There is little consensus among staff in the pilot districts on how full-time programs have changed under P2R. Several interviewees thought that class groupings were more homogeneous, and thus more appropriate. An equal number, however, believed that no change had occurred. A large majority of the special education teachers surveyed this year (65%) believe the grouping of their students to be about as appropriate as before P2R. Additionally they believe that students are as similar now in terms of age, intelligence, reading skill, math skill and behavior as before P2R. A substantial minority of teachers feel, however, that their students are more appropriately grouped under P2R (29%) and that their classes are more homogeneous (20%). (Appendix Tables C-28 and C-29)

Teachers and parents are satisfied with current class structures. Nearly three-quarters of special education teachers indicated that P2R class structure is able to accommodate the diversity of students' instructional needs. A similar proportion of teachers reported that most or all of their students need the related services required for them by P2R (Appendix Tables C-30 and C-31) Three-quarters of those parents who indicated that their child's educational program had changed under P2R feel that the current program is more appropriate for their child. Eight percent reported no difference in the program and seven percent felt that the current program is less appropriate. (Appendix Table C-32).

In-Class Programs

P2R expanded the model of part-time education to include both support and replacement instruction and to allow both support and replacement services to be provided in the regular class as well as in the resource center. The intent is to provide additional opportunities for special education students to participate in a regular education program which is the least restrictive environment.

Nature of Services

All of the pilot districts offered in-class programs this year. Fifty-eight of 103 resource center teachers reported providing in-class services to an average of 9 students per teacher. They served, on average, 7 students in elementary schools, 7 students in middle schools and 18 students in high schools. Ninety-five cooperating regular education teachers reported that on average 7 students received in-class services in their classroom.

Special education teachers provide, on average, in-class services for 11 periods per week, which was similar across grade levels. For individual resource center teachers, the number of periods per week ranged from a low of one to a high of 30. Cooperating teachers reported that a resource center teacher comes into their classroom on average about six periods per week (or four hours, for those reporting in hours). Resource room teachers provide in-class services, on average, in three different classes. Cooperating teachers reported that, on average, one teacher provides special education in their classroom, with the number of teachers ranging from one to four.

Most resource center teachers help non-classified as well as classified students when delivering in-class services. Approximately 80% of classroom teachers reported that the resource center teachers worked with non-classified students when they delivered in-class services and approximately 70% of the resource center teachers reported that they did so.

Nearly all in-class teachers used one-on-one instruction and nearly all delivered services at the student's desk. Over half used collaborative teaching. (Appendix Tables C-33 and C-34) Nearly one-half of the resource room teachers and cooperating teachers reported that the resource room teachers covered reading, mathematics, language arts, reading and study skills and provide help with homework. In addition, a majority of resource center teachers indicated that they provide support in science and social studies. (Appendix Tables C-35)

The in-class program is, for the most part, serving students who would have been pulled out for resource room instruction. The overwhelming majority of resource center teachers (85%) indicated that most of the students now served by in-class programs would have been pulled out of their class for instruction and another 12% reported that most of their students would not have received any support services. (Appendix Table C-36). Directors confirmed that most students served by in-class programs would have been served by resource center programs in the past.

Problems with Implementing In-Class

Last year, directors, resource center teachers and classroom teachers identified scheduling, lack of consultation time, noise/distractions, space and facilities, and relationships between the teachers as problems they encountered in implementing in-class programs in their districts. Interviews with directors and surveys of resource center teachers and cooperating teachers show that these problems continued into the second year of implementation.

The most significant problems encountered by both the resource center teacher and the cooperating teacher in providing in-class services were noise and other distractions in the classroom, scheduling, and lack of consultation time. The problem with scheduling students involved trying to place a sufficient number of students needing in-class services in the same classroom so that it was efficient for a resource center teacher to serve them in their regular classroom. Resource center teachers also identified space/facilities in the classroom and reluctance on the part of student(s) being served to be problems. Few resource center teachers or cooperating teachers cited problems with students, parents or their own relationships. (Appendix Table C-37)

With regard to consultation time, nearly all of the cooperating teachers indicated that the resource center teacher provided consultation to them concerning their students, but less than half (44%) reported that they were provided specific consultation time in their schedules. Classroom teachers reported that most consultation between the two teachers is through direct teacher contact (93%). Less than half (41%) have mutual planning periods. (Appendix Table C-38). Directors reported difficulty in scheduling common planning periods for the teachers. Thus it appears that much of the consultation takes place on off hours, during lunch, in the halls, etc. More than half (57%) of the classroom teachers reported that they were very dissatisfied or moderately dissatisfied with the amount of consultation time in their schedule. (Appendix Table C-39).

Other problems cited by the directors were lack of resources for staff and training; attitudinal problems of teachers, resulting in territorial issues or lack of flexibility on the part of teachers to accommodate another person in the classroom; mismatch of teachers; and insufficient training to help teachers work together. One small district suggested that in-class services are seen as a frill in that district when budgets are tight.

Factors facilitating the implementation of in-class programs

Nearly all special education teachers, cooperating teachers and special education directors cited a good working relationship with the classroom teacher as the most important factor facilitating in-class programs. Teachers' involvement in planning, building level supervisory support of the program and the special education teachers' prior experience with in-class services were also cited frequently by all three groups. (Appendix Tables C-40 and C-41)

Interviews with directors and training specialists generally supported the survey data. Directors cited as facilitating factors willingness of the teachers to work together, building level administrative support, previous experience with in-class programs, parent awareness and support, administrative mandate to carry out in-class services, and the commitment and ability of teachers. Also in several districts, the success of the program the first year increased the support for the program the second year. Directors emphasized the importance of matching teachers carefully.

Benefits of in-class services

District administrators, teachers, parents and students were all generally satisfied with the in-class programs this year and felt this approach provides major benefits to students. Directors were very satisfied with in-class programs and, in many districts, plan to expand the program next year. They feel that the teachers tended to learn from each other and to gain a better understanding of the other's role. They noted that in-class programs expand services and resources available to students, provide special education students with the same curriculum as non-classified students, and reduce the fragmentation of the student's instructional day. Special education students feel better about themselves and regular education students became more accepting of special education students and of their own weaknesses.

In-class services helped students most in improving academic skills, self-esteem, work habits. More than half of the special education teachers and cooperating teachers reported that in-class services improved the academic skills, self-esteem and work habits of their students to a considerable extent. Nearly 40% of both groups indicated that in-class services improved the social skills and the interactions of their students with peers to some or a considerable extent. (Appendix Tables C-42 and C-43) Two-thirds of resource center teachers and of cooperating teachers reported that most students served were able to keep up with the non-classified students in the class.

Students in the pilot districts responded, overall, very favorably towards their in-class experiences. Students in three of the group interviews reported that the teachers taught as a team, and they liked this approach. In one case they saw no difference between the two teachers in terms of their responsibility; in the other two cases, one teacher was the content area teacher and the other helped with study skills and reinforcing what the subject area teacher said. Students in the other group interviews said the support teacher circulated around the room and helped students at their desks or in small groups. Non-classified students also indicated that they could ask questions of the support teacher.

Most classified students said that they liked in-class programs, that their grades had gone up, and that they are able to keep up with the class. Some students reported receiving higher test scores because the extra teacher helped clarify instructions and the teachers gave them guides to study for tests. Students also said they received help with reports and using library resources. Students indicated that having two teachers made the class more interesting and learning more fun, it enabled the teachers to cover more material, and they found it easier to ask questions and get answers more quickly. Students also indicated that the teachers had high expectations for them and that they had been able to meet those expectations. No one reported feeling embarrassed to have a support teacher helping them; they seemed to appreciate the assistance.

There were few negative comments about in-class programs. One student indicated that she had to work harder and needed more support. Another student indicated that he missed the small group setting. Several students who receive resource room instruction and in-class services indicated that the two methods serve different purposes and they did not prefer one over the other. Most students, however, indicated that they prefer in-class programs and would like it expanded to other classes, particularly the harder courses.

Ninety-three percent of the parents of classified children who received in-class services were satisfied with the program. Only four percent reported being dissatisfied. (Appendix Table C-45)

Support for In-Class Instruction

Teachers who participated in in-class programs like the program and the more general approach of having another teacher in their classroom. Over 80% of both special education teachers and classroom teachers were satisfied with their in-class experiences this year. (Appendix Tables C-46 and C-47) Both groups reported a similar level of satisfaction last year. Cooperating teachers are also more likely than other teachers to support the idea of having another teacher instruct students in their classroom. In 1987-88, slightly less than half (44%) of a random sample of all classroom teachers indicated that they thought having another teacher in their classroom was a good idea. Two years after districts implemented in-class services, three-quarters of the cooperating teachers, but only 47% of teachers who did not participate in the in-class program, supported the idea. Nearly two-thirds of this latter group of teachers had never had another teacher instruct students in their classroom. It appears, then, that familiarity with in-class or collaborative teaching programs may have increased acceptance of these approaches. (Appendix Tables C-48 and C-49)

Cooperating teachers are somewhat more likely (82%) than teachers without in-class programs (70%) to feel they are meeting the needs of their special education students moderately or very well. And more than half of the cooperating teachers (54%) feel that they are meeting the needs of their special education students better today than before P2R. (Appendix Tables C-50 and C-51) Cooperating teachers are also more likely to be satisfied with the assistance they receive for their classified students (81%) than teachers without in-class programs (71%) or teachers who were surveyed two years ago (73%). (Appendix Table C-52)

Impact of P2R on Staffing and Staff Roles and Responsibilities

Changes in Staffing

Directors indicated that there were few changes in staffing and most were due to population changes rather than P2R. Table 3-10 shows the number of child study team members employed by each district in the 1989-90 academic year and totals across the pilot districts for 1987-88, the year prior to the implementation of P2R. Overall, the pilot districts hired 20.6 new child study team members: 4.7 psychologists, 3.9 social workers, 6.0 learning consultants, and 6.0 speech-language therapists. This was the equivalent of an average increase of 1.6 FTE per district, or about 15%. Of the 13 districts listed, nine showed increases in child study staff and one a minimal decrease. Most of the increase occurred in Bergen (+6.4 FTEs), which expanded its special education program dramatically over the two years; Elizabeth (+6.5 FTEs); and Galloway (+3.15 FTEs), which had a 36% increase in enrollment. Three directors indicated that they had added speech language specialists due to their increased workloads and one district added a psychologist to cover the increased counseling load. The pilot districts also added over 50 special education teachers betweenn 1987-88 and 1989-90, reflecting the growth in the number of special education programs. Two districts reportedly added resource center teachers to assist with the in-class program.

Insert Table 3-10 here

Child study team roles and responsibilities

In 1987-88, child study team members reported that their primary responsibilities were for pupil evaluation. They engaged in other activities, however, including consultation. Special education teachers indicated that they frequently sought and provided assistance to child study teams. Regular education teachers, however, generally did not request help from this source for either mainstreamed handicapped students or for non-classified students with learning difficulties.

The most dramatic changes in roles and responsibilities of CST members under P2R were cited by speech/language specialists who had become case managers and members of the child study team and the SRC. Half of the speech language specialists reported spending more time on testing and 36% on parent interviews. In 1987-88, speech language specialists were involved in fewer than 25% of evaluations. In 1989-90, they participated in 42% of all evaluations across the pilot districts. As shown in Table 3-11, their involvement was concentrated in the early grades: 76% of pre-K and kindergarten evaluations, 37% of evaluations in grades 1-3 and only 15% of high school evaluations. Half of the speech language specialists spent more time on case management and consultation with teachers and administrators and nearly all reported an increase in paperwork. Twenty-eight percent reported spending less time in direct services to students. (Appendix Table C-53)

Insert Table 3-11 here

Directors were also cognizant of the change in the responsibilities and workloads of the speech/language specialists as members of the child study teams. Three districts added speech language specialists to help with the workload. In another district, the director tried to alleviate some of the burden by having half of the speech/language specialists function as CST members and the other half as service providers only. The director in another district indicated that speech/language specialists in her district are clearly overburdened and she is exploring ways to address the problem.

A majority of the other CST members stated that they spent less time testing and more time consulting with teachers and administrators, on case management and serving on the SRC than before the advent of P2R. Half of the psychologists and social workers report they spent more time counseling students. About one-quarter of the LDTCs and psychologists spent more time interviewing parents, but only 13% of the social workers indicated they spent less time on this activity. More than two-thirds of the team members spent more time on paperwork. Few child study team members reported spending less time on most of their activities. (Appendix Table C-53). This contributes to the perception among CST members that their workload has increased under P2R.

The workload of the special education teachers appears to have increased in most areas as well. Half reported an increase in time spent on consulting with child study team members. (This is consistent with the responses of CST members, who indicated spending more time consulting with teachers.) About half of special education teachers reported spending more time in instructional planning, curriculum development and consulting with other teachers as well. Seventy percent reported an increase in time spent on paperwork. Less than 10% reported spending less time in any activity, except teaching, where 11% reported spending less time. (Appendix Table C-54)

Overall Appraisal of the Special Education Delivery System

Both regular and special education staff have found the changes in the special education delivery system under P2R to be professionally sound and of considerable benefit to classified students. More than half of the special education teachers (56%) felt that special education is more effective today than in the years before the implementation of P2R. Only 13% reported that it was less effective. (Appendix Table C-55) Students are evaluated by fewer staff and child study team members use more informal assessment measures and fewer standardized tests. Most child study team members find results from these assessments helpful in making instructional recommendations, classification decisions, and placement decisions. Screenings by school nurses and/or reviews of students' medical histories have replaced comprehensive medical examinations in many cases and generally provide sufficient information for making classification decisions.

The time that team members save by doing less testing is spent consulting with teachers and administrators, on case management, serving on the SRC and doing paperwork. The exception is speech/language specialists whose overall role was expanded. They conducted more evaluations, especially at the kindergarten and primary grades, and spent more time on case management and consultation with teachers and administrators. A sizable minority reported spending less time providing direct services to students.

Child study team members consider the new eligibility criteria to be professionally sound in all of the domain and impact areas. A large majority feel that the criteria facilitate appropriate assessment of students and identify the appropriate students for special education most of the time. Changes from medical to instructionally relevant labels for classification have increased parents' satisfaction with their child's classification and improved communication between parents and school staff. While new labels do not appear to have changed students' self-perceptions or instructional planning, few team members, special education teachers or parents feel that the old classification system was better.

The structure of special education has undergone only modest change under P2R. The number of classifications have remained stable. More students are classified part-time now, due in large part to the additional time allowed for part-time programs under P2R. Districts have increased the number of part-time programs accordingly, but reduced the number of full-time programs only slightly. The new system has not affected the amount of instructional time that students spend in special education. Full-time class groupings are as, or more, homogeneous than before the implementation of P2R and the class structure is generally able to accommodate the diversity of students' instructional needs. Although the names of the full-time programs changed, the instructional focus and content of the classes remained generally the same.

The largest programmatic change under P2R has been the provision for in-class services. More than half of resource center teachers in the pilot districts provide support services in classified students' regular classrooms. In most cases, they serve students who would have been pulled out of class for resource room instruction. District administrators, teachers, parents and students were all generally satisfied with the program and many of the pilot districts plan to expand in-class services next year. Although teachers were concerned about noise and distractions in the classroom, scheduling and lack of consultation time, most of the resource center teachers and classroom teachers were satisfied with their in-class experiences. In-class services improved students' academic skills, self-esteem, work habits and social skills; expanded the services and resources available to students; provided special education students with the same curriculum as non-classified students; and reduced the amount of time that classified students were pulled out of class. A majority of the classified students were able to keep up with their classmates and students were not embarrassed to have the help. Parents were overwhelmingly satisfied with the program.

Table 3-1

Number of Classified Special Education Students* and as a Percent of Resident Enrollment

District	Special Education Students, 12/1/1989	Percent of Resident Students, 1989-90	Special Education Students, 12/1/1988	Percent of Resident Students, 1988-89	Percent of Resident Students, 1987-88
Belvidere	92	21.4	112	26.0	28.3
Harmony	69	17.1	70	17.7	16.3
Hope	53	20.8	55	20.9	23.0
White	90	16.6	103	18.8	17.8
Bergen Voc.	504	33.6	532	33.4	32.4
Bernardsville**	109	14.1	116	13.4	16.1
Elizabeth	2050	13.8	2099	13.9	14.8
Galloway	362	15.5	372	17.7	19.9
Holmdel	147	6.5	160	6.8	7.7
Manchester	478	18.1	501	18.9	19.7
Ocean City	277	16.5	273	16.3	15.5
Pennsville	304	12.8	288	12.0	12.4
Washington	287	11.5	309	12.4	13.8
Pilot Totals	4822	14.6	4990	15.5	16.0

* Includes eligible for speech only.

** Number of special education students includes students received from two non-operating districts. Resident enrollment is for Bernardsville only.

Sources: Special education students: 1987-88 through 1989-90 Special Education Plan: Part Two, Table 1; District resident enrollments: AASA Forms, 1987 through 1989.

Table 3-2

Special Education Students* by Classification, 1989-90

District	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Related Services*
Belvidere	39	39	0
Harmony	49	15	1
Hope	13	23	0
White	43	25	0
Bergen Voc-Tech	394	109	8
Bernardsville	16	56	1
Elizabeth	1141	418	22
Galloway	122	129	4
Holmdel	34	68	1
Manchester	157	209	4
Ocean City	79	129	1
Pennsville	147	69	3
Washington Twp.	79	132	8
Pilot Totals	2313	1421	53

* Does not include eligible for speech only.

Source: 1989-90 Special Education Plan: Part Two, Table 1.

Table 3-3

Number and Type of Professionals Involved in All Initial Evaluations Conducted in 1989-90

District	Psychologist	Learning Consult.	Social Worker	Speech Therap.	Doctor	Students Evaluated
Belvidere	22	19	17	5	3	27
Harmony	5	5	2	7	3	7
Hope	5	7	2	5	2	8
White	5	9	6	7	3	10
Bergen Voc	3	3	1	1	0	3
Bernardsville	21	20	7	6	13	24
Elizabeth	207	197	190	75	0*	255
Galloway	28	28	7	12	1	29
Holmdel	40	38	4	22	9	40
Manchester	22	14	4	9	9	25
Ocean City	36	33	2	25	17	37
Pennsville	43	44	8	41	9	53
Washington	69	66	8	33	46	73
TOTAL	505	483	258	248	115	591

* All pupils in Elizabeth receive an annual physical examination by the school physician. The results of the examination are sent with the pupil's referral. No comprehensive medical was requested by the child study team.

Source: Division of Special Education Pupil Record Information Data Base, 1989-90

Table 3-4

Number of Classifications Before and After the Advent of P2R

District	Average for Years 1984-85 through 1987-88	Average for Years 1988-89 through 1989-90	1988-89 only	1989-90 only
Belvidere	25	9	9	8
Harmony	11	8	8	7*
Hope	4	3	4	2
White	12	8	8	8
Bergen Voc	1**	3	2	3
Bernardsville	17	12	10	14
Elizabeth	240	250	227	273
Galloway	33	42	31	53
Holmdel	22	31	31	30
Manchester	43	38	45	30
Ocean City	37	41	39	43
Pennsville	29	32	27	36
Washington Twp	46	43	44	41
Average for Pilot	43	43	40	46
Pilot Average without Elizabeth	25	25	23	25

* Includes one pending classification.
** Data were available for three of four years.

Source: Pilot district data from End of the Year Reports, Table 1, 1984-85 through 1989-90.

Table 3-5

Number of Declassifications Before and After Advent of P2R

District	Average for Years 1984-85 through 1987-88	Average for Years 1988-89 through 1989-90	1988-89 only	1989-90 only
Belvidere	6***	6	3	8
Harmony	1***	1	0	1
Hope	2	4	6	1
White	3	5	7	2
Bergen Voc	*	2	1	3
Bernardsville	9**	3	1	5
Elizabeth	31	13	16	9
Galloway	10	7	6	7
Holmdel	7	6	8	4
Manchester	6	15	3	26
Ocean City	9**	8	9	6
Pennsville	8***	11	6	16
Washington Twp	4	5	7	3
Average for Pilot	8	7	6	8
Pilot Average without Elizabeth	6	6	5	7

Note: Averages taken over all districts are based only on those districts with data for at least three of the four years, 1984-87 and data for 1988-89.

* Data were not available for any year.
** Data were available for two of four years.
*** Data were available for three of four years.

Source: Pilot district data from End of the Year Reports, Table 1, 1984-85 through 1989-90.

Table 3-6

Number of Full-time Programs by District for 1989-90

District	LD	MC	PRE	MB	CH	Total
Belvidere	3		1	1		5
Harmony	2	1				3
Hope						0
White						0
Bergen Voc	21	16				37
Bernardsville	1					1
Elizabeth	57	8	4	13	6	88
Galloway	8	2	2	1		13
Holmdel	2		1			3
Manchester	11	1	2	1		15
Ocean City	3					3
Pennsville	6	1	1	2	3	13
Washington	7	2	2			11
TOTAL	121	31	13	18	9	192

LD - Learning Disability
MC - Moderate Cognitive
PRE - Preschool
MB - Moderate Behavior
CH - Communication Handicap

Source: 1989-90 Special Education Plan: Part Two, Table 7.

Table 3-7

Number of Full-time and Part-time Programs by District, 1987-88 through 1989-90

District	Full-time Programs 87-88	Full-time Programs 88-89	Full-time Programs 89-90	Part-time Programs 87-88	Part-time Programs 88-89	Part-time Programs 89-90
Belvidere	4	6	5	9	9	10
Harmony	3	3	3	2	2	2.1
Hope	0	0	0	1.5	1.5	1.5
White	0	0	0	2	2	2
Bergen Voc.	2	26	37	0	5	7
Bernardsville	4	1	1	4	7	7
Elizabeth	97	82	88	14	28	30
Galloway	9	11	13	9.5	11.5	12.1
Holmdel	3	1	3	5	7	8
Manchester	14	15	15	13	16	17
Ocean City	2	4	3	14	15	16
Pennsville	17	16	13	1	2	6
Washington	10	10	11	13	13	13
Total	165	175	192	88	119	131.7

Source: Special Education Plans: Part Two, Table 7, for 1987-88 through 1989-90.

Table 3-8

Percent of Students Receiving Different Amounts of Instructional Time in Special Education

Percent of Instructional Time	Part-time Students (N - 1496)	Full-time Students (N - 2189)
1- 9.99	9.7	0.0
10-14.99	16.2	0.5
15-19.99	5.5	0.0
20-24.99	6.6	0.0
25-29.99	21.3	0.2
30-34.99	6.4	0.4
35-39.99	13.6	0.1
40-45.99	7.2	0.1
45-49.99	1.3	0.5
50-55.99	11.4	3.5
55-59.99	0.0	0.2
60-69.99	0.0	16.0
70-79.99	0.0	9.3
80-89.99	0.0	12.0
90-100	0.0	57.4

Source: Division of Special Education Pupil Record Information Data Base, 1989-90.

Table 3-9

Handicapped Students Receiving Related Services
as a Percentage of Those in an Eligibility Category for 1989-90

Service	Eligible for Related Services* (N - 53)	Part-time Students (N - 1421)	Full-time Students (N - 2313)
Counseling	47.2	15.1	33.2
Speech/Language	18.9	13.4	39.6
Occupational Therapy	26.4	0.1	9.3
Physical Therapy	13.2	0.2	5.1

* Does not include eligible for speech only.

Source: 1989-90 Special Education Plan: Part Two, Table 6.

Table 3-10

Pupil/Team Ratio and Number of Child Study Team Members in Full-Time Equivalents for 1989-90

District	Pupil/ Team Ratio	Psychol- ogist	Social Worker	Learning Consult.	Speech Therap.	Total Team Members
Belvidere	764	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	6.0
Harmony	743	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.6	2.2*
Hope	940	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	1.2
White	638	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.0*
Bergen Voc	375	4.0	4.0	7.0	2.6	17.6*
Bernardsville	773	1.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	3.6**
Elizabeth	1065	14.0	16.0	14.0	14.0	58.0*
Galloway	819	2.85	1.2	3.0	3.6	10.65*
Holmdel	1257	1.8	1.0	2.0	2.6	7.4*
Manchester	881	3.0	3.0	4.0	7.5	17.5*
Ocean City	559	3.0	2.4	3.0	3.0	11.4*
Pennsville	1184	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.6	7.6*
Washington	1050	2.8	2.0	4.0	6.0	14.8
Average	921	2.8	2.6	3.2	3.5	12.4*

* Increase over 1987-88
** Decrease from 1987-88

Note: The Pupil/Team ratio is the total number of students served by the school district divided by the number of psychologists. The average pupil/team ratio is the total number of students served by all districts divided by the total number of psychologists.

Sources: Child Study Team members: Special Education Plan: Part Two, Table 5; District resident enrollments: AASA Forms, 1989.

Table 3-11

Percent of Referred Students Receiving Speech/Language Evaluation in 1989-90 by Grade Level

District	Number of Speech Evaluations	Total Evaluations	Percent Receiving Evaluation
Pre-kindergarten	63	78	81%
Kindergarten	25	38	66
Grade 1	37	83	45
Grade 2	26	89	29
Grade 3	23	62	37
Grade 4	18	41	44
Grade 5	13	41	32
Grade 6	8	34	24
Grade 7	3	21	14
Grade 8	7	26	27
Grade 9	3	19	16
Grade 10	1	9	5
Grade 11	2	12	17
Grade 12	0	1	0
TOTAL	248	591	42

Source: Division of Special Education Pupil Record Information Data Base, 1989-90

CHAPTER 4

PLANNING AND TRAINING

This chapter summarizes the P2R planning process the districts underwent in the first year and identifies strategies that facilitated effective planning and implementation. It also describes state and local P2R training activites in the three years of the pilot project. More detail can be found on both topics in Goertz et. al., 1988 and 1989.

P2R Planning Activities

The first year of the pilot project was devoted to planning for the implementation of P2R. Under direction from the DSE, the pilot districts spent their first year (1) reconfiguring special education program options and reclassifying special education students; (2) developing class profiles; (3) reviewing and revising special education curricula; (4) developing in-class special education programs; and (5) developing policies and procedures for establishing and operating school resource committees. The strategies adopted by districts in these activities reflected their organizational structure and culture, resources available to support planning activities and their existing special education administrative procedures.

The process of reconfiguring special education program options and reclassifying special education students went smoothly. Most districts used existing student data to reevaluate student needs in light of the new special education guidelines and reconfigured program options accordingly. The actual reclassification of students flowed naturally out of the program reconfiguration activities and generally occurred as part of the annual IEP meeting. The development of class profiles was not viewed as a high priority activity in the pilot districts. In most districts, the class profiles were based on actual student characteristics and revised the following summer and fall to bring the profile description in line with the classes, IEPs, and goals and objectives and to provide more detail. Few districts used class profiles for placement of students. Districts' approaches to revising the special education curriculum reflected the status of the special education curriculum already on the books. Districts that did not have fully developed special education curricula at the beginning of P2R are working to produce a new curriculum, while those with more comprehensive curricula have focused on revising and modifying goals and objectives, adding study skills, etc.

The special education directors, who served as directors of the pilot projects, had a major role in setting policies and procedures for special education programs and services in all of the districts. They were generally assisted in this task by the training specialists. The directors differed in the extent to which they became involved in activities outside of their own sphere, such as planning the SRCs and working with building principals. Time constraints appear to have limited the involvement of child study team members in the development of new policies and procedures. Their primary P2R task was reconfiguring students according to P2R guidelines.

School district administrators varied more in their involvement in P2R planning. For example, a few district superintendents actively participated in the development of some aspects of policy and/or procedures for P2R. Other superintendents delegated this responsibility, most often to the special education director and/or school principals. The superintendents were particularly helpful when they facilitated planning activities by issuing clear mandates supportive of P2R. Some building principals participated in the creation of their school resource committees; all were involved in scheduling special education students and faculty. Principals' efforts to facilitate P2R in their buildings ranged from resistance to full cooperation.

Other program directors, guidance personnel, teachers and parents played a limited role in the P2R planning process.

Policies and procedures for the SRC were developed in one of three ways: (1) the training specialist and special education director developed them with a minimum of input from other education staff; (2) the training specialist and special education director solicited substantial input from district administrators; and (3) a district-wide committee, composed of both regular and special education staff, was formed to draft them. Generally decisions concerning the composition of the SRC, the selection of SRC members and the scheduling of meetings were made at the building level, while policies concerning the size and compensation of members was a district decision.

Five types of problems cut across the planning activities and the pilot districts. The first was the lack of time. Most districts found they had insufficient time in which to train staff, develop new forms and procedures, review each student's educational needs and to plan to reorganize programs. The responsibility for planning activities fell on the special education director, the training specialists and often the members of the child study team. The director and CST members had to conduct these activities in addition to their regular work. This placed a particular burden on districts with part-time CST members. The second is timing of the planning activities and training. In some cases, like the SRC, training came late in the school year after the district was to have developed policies and procedures. The timeline for completing the class profile was not in line with P2R training and other district processes. A third problem involved scheduling--of people to meet to plan P2R activities and of students and classes to meet P2R requirements. Fourth was a lack of resources to compensate staff for activities like curriculum development. The fifth problem was insufficient involvement of regular education staff in the planning of P2R activities that would affect them directly, like in-class special education services and the SRC.

Several effective strategies emerged from our study of the pilot districts' planning activities. These included involving all special education personnel, including special education teachers, in the process of reconfiguring special education options; scheduling regular education classes with, or around, special education classes; and using the class profiles as a planning tool to assess student needs, train staff in new classifications and new ways of looking at students and class groupings, and to plan and revise curriculum and materials. Using a committee process that includes both regular and special education personnel to review and revise special education curriculum, design in-class special education services, and design SRC policies and procedures; providing released time or extra compensation for staff involved in the planning activities; and conducting special training sessions for regular classroom teachers also facilitated the planning process.

P2R Training Activities

During the first year of the pilot project, the DSE and local districts conducted training to provide district personnel with the knowledge and/or skills necessary to implement P2R. State training focused on eligibility requirements, assessment, IEP development, consultation, program options, school resource committee and mainstreaming techniques. Child study team members received the most training. Other groups specifically targeted included special education teachers, principals, school nurses,and speech and language specialists. The general reaction to the quality of the state training was favorable, although attendees expressed concerns about the distances required to attend training, scheduling of training sessions, and conflicts between participating in training and meeting service delivery needs. District staff recommended that the information needs and expertise of local staff be assessed before planning or conducting a state training session.

The DSE required local districts to present an overview of P2R to their administrative staff, instructional staff, child study teams, guidance personnel, school nurses, school board members and parents. Districts were also required to conduct IEP training for child study team members, administrators, instructional staff, principals and parents. Districts varied in the content and format of training as well as the extent to which they met or exceeded state requirements. Of all groups, child study team members received the most extensive local training to prepare them for changes in roles and procedures for assessment, reconfiguration, IEP development, and, to a lesser extent, consultation. The majority of special education teachers received overviews and IEP training. Regular education teachers received more limited training. Few districts specifically trained general education and special education staff to deliver services cooperatively. All of the pilot districts made efforts to provide training to parents.

During the first year, some factors began to emerge as potential influences upon training and planning within and among districts. These factors included: leadership at the district and building level in support of P2R, conditions within the district, attitudes of regular and special education staff, availability of resources, coordination of services, and ability to provide training in cooperative services, as well as to identify and address training needs with the district.

In the second year of the pilot, training at the local level was delivered on an as needed basis. Training specialists generally acted as facilitators or consultants rather than providing formal training sessions. This role reflected the feeling among many district staff that the training provided in the first year prepared them well to implement P2R. In the second year they needed help with specific implementation problems. When workshops were given they focused on IEP development, group skills and brainstorming, changing roles of CST members, modifying curricula, counseling and report writing. Training specialists also provided orientation for new staff and conducted follow-up sessions to state training. Only a few districts trained regular eduction staff, although interviewees across all the pilot districts mentioned a need for this training. When available, sessions for regular education staff covered mainstreaming, in-class instruction, eligibility, and the atypical learner.

Interviewees generally found the state training sessions on the evaluation plan, assessment, curriculum modification and eligibility, part-time program options, and sessions that included teams of regular and special education personnel as helpful in the second year. Some respondents, however, felt that the sessions were too theoretical and did not provide the "nuts and bolts" information local staff wanted and needed. In addition, the sessions were too general and did not focus on the specific needs of the districts in implementing P2R. Some workshops came too late in the year to be useful.

In general, districts found the in-district training the most helpful in the second year of the pilot because it focused on the particular problems facing district staff. Interviewees identified several areas where they felt they needed additional training: review of IEP and special education requirements; the use of formal and informal assessment instruments; and counseling They also stated that regular education staff needed to be included in the training sessions, especially those on eligibility criteria and program options.

Training was much more limited in the third year of the pilot project. Most training specialists believed that SRC members had been well-trained in the second year of the project, and provided on-going training for new members and some refresher training for others as well. Two districts held training for teachers participating in in-class programs. One district provided training for all new special education staff to give them an overview into P2R and trained all special education staff in code changes. In another district, the training specialist provided a three-day session for all new child study team members. One district held a workshop for child study team members on informal measures in assessment.

State training in year three was also limited and focused on particular aspects of P2R where additional training was needed. The sessions held were:

- Full-time program curriculum for teachers of full-time students, pre-school through high school, held in December, 1989.
- Speech assessments for speech/language specialists, held in December 1989.

- Part-time program options for special education teachers in part-time programs, held in March 1990: one session in the north for elementary teachers; one session in the south for elementary teachers; and one session in the central part of the state for secondary teachers.

- Child study team strategies for all CST members, held in April 1990.

- Class profiles for teachers in full time programs, held in May of 1990.

Sessions followed a format suggested in the previous year of having small working and discussion groups, followed by a discussion with all the participants. Training specialists attended all sessions and facilitated the discussions. The sessions received very high ratings by participants.

Districts varied somewhat on opinions about training needs, but there were a number of suggestions for additional training related to the SRC. Several training specialists suggested the importance of having the new SRC members trained in an apprenticeship manner. Other SRC training needs included problem-solving techniques, including brainstorming; how to function as a group; options to pulling students out of class, and other curriculum modifications; and assessment strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. Several training specialists indicated that regular education teachers needed more training in how to access the SRC, what it is and what can be expected of it. Despite many teachers who are using the SRC successfully, there are some who are still reluctant and some who do not understand the process. Several districts indicated that some teachers still believe if they take a problem to SRC it will be taken away from them and solved outside the classroom. Several training specialists indicated that regular education needed more training in instructional and behavioral modifications and how they can be used to meet student needs. Some teachers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are not capable of carrying out the assistance plans suggested, without further training. One training specialist suggested that training should originate from regular education to reinforce regular education ownership.

Directors and training specialists also indicated that some additional training in support of in-class programs would be beneficial, particularly training that helped to clarify the roles of the two teachers and how they could best work together.

Another frequently mentioned area for more training was to help CST members function as a team. Interviewees also indicated a need to provide CST members with more training on formal assessment and selection of instruments. Several districts cited the need to involve regular education staff in the training for P2R, and in training regular education teachers to use behavioral and instructional modifications to better serve mainstreamed students.

Interviewees in several districts indicated the usefulness of sharing ideas, both within and among pilot districts on various aspects of P2R. Several districts suggested that training should be on-going rather than a single workshop on a particular topic. Overall, however, most training specialists and directors were generally satisfied with the level of training received in the pilot project.

Appendix A

Appendix Table A-1

Response Rates to Surveys

Survey	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Response Rate
SRC Member	262	231	88.2
SRC User	402	303	75.4
Special Education Teacher	302	290	96.0
Cooperating Classroom Teacher	130	111	85.4
Other Classroom Teacher	268	192	71.6
Child Study Team	167	161	96.4

Appendix B

Table B-1

Percent of SRC Members responding:

Which of the following procedures does your school use to notify parents of SRC actions? (n = 215)

Parents are consulted by the referring staff member regarding the student's problem prior to a decision to refer to the SRC.	61%
Parents are notified of the Request for Assistance before a meeting is scheduled.	71
Parents are notified of the Request for Assistance only after a meeting has been scheduled.	17
Parents are sent a copy of the initial Assistance Plan.	34
Parents are sent a copy of the Follow-up Plan(s).	33
Parents are informed of any changes made to their child's program.	57
Parents are invited to SRC meetings as observers.	11
Parents are invited to participate in SRC meetings.	35

Table B-2

Percent of SRC members responding:

Which of the following best describes your position in your school? (n = 224)

Principal	17%
Assistant principal	5
Regular classroom teacher	29
Child Study Team member	25
Basic skills or remedial education teacher	7
Bilingual/ESL teacher	1
Guidance counselor	7
School nurse	3
Curriculum coordinator or supervisor of instruction	3
Other	5

Table B-3

Percent of SRC members responding:

Were you a member of a School Resource Committee last year (1988-89 school year?) (n = 225)

No, I was not an SRC member last year.	26%
Yes, I was a member of the same SRC I now serve on.	66
Yes, I was a member of a different SRC in this school.	3
Yes, I was a member of an SRC in a different school in the same district.	4
Yes, I was a member of an SRC in a different district.	1

Table B-4

Percent of SRC members responding:

Which of the following best describes the position of the person who usually chairs your School Resource Committee meetings? (n = 220)

Principal	62%
Assistant principal	15
Regular classroom teacher	5
Child Study Team member	4
Basic skills or remedial education teacher	0
Bilingual/ESL teacher	0
Guidance counselor	6
School nurse	0
Curiculum coordinator or supervisor of instruction	2
Other	6

Table B-5

Percent of SRC members responding:

About how many meetings of your School Resource Committee did you attend since September? Exclude training meetings. (n = 220)

0	4%
1 - 4	21
5 - 10	46
11 - 15	17
16 - 20	4
More than 20	7

Table B-6

Percent of SRC members responding:

When does your School Resource Committee usually meet? (n = 221)

Before school	14%
During school hours	67
After school	13
We meet both during school hours and before and/or after school.	6

Table B-7

Percent of SRC members responding:

How long do your SRC meetings usually last? (n = 220)

Less than 30 minutes	6%
30 - 45 minutes	56
45 - 60 minutes	18
More than one hour	21

Table B-8

Percent of SRC members responding:

Outside of meetings, about how much time do you typically spend each month on SRC activities? (n = 219)

0 hours	10%
1-5 hours	80
6-10 hours	6
More than 10 hours	4

Table B-9

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

How is your time at SRC meetings covered?

	SRC Member	Referring Staff
No coverage is required.	84%	64%
Another teacher covers my class.	11	26
A substitute teacher covers my class.	11	21
N =	220	262

Table B-10

Percent of SRC members who are compensated responding:

How are you compensated for your attendance at SRC meetings?	(n = 55)
I receive monetary compensation.	87%
I receive compensatory time.	6
I receive other compensation	9
I do not receive any compensation.	0

Table B-11

Percent of SRC members responding:

How often do you feel that the medical and health information you receive is sufficient for making SRC decisions? (n = 216)

In all cases	17%
In most cases	38
In some cases	26
In a few cases	13
In no cases	6

Table B-12

Percent of SRC members responding:

How often do you feel that the school nurse is appropriately involved in providing information for SRC decisions? (n = 214)

In all cases	33%
In most cases	29
In some cases	15
In a few cases	18
In no cases	5

Table B-13

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

Did your School Resource Committee encounter any of the following problems this year?

	SRC Member	Referring Staff
Scheduling meetings	42%	17%
Inconsistent attendance of SRC members at meetings	11	n.a
Coverage of classes	24	9
Compensation of SRC members	22	n.a
Not enough time to review cases	27	n.a
Inadequate screening of requests for assistance	12	n.a
Lack of agreement among SRC members on appropriate assistance options	7	14
Failure to formulate useful recommendations	18	19
Preparation of inappropriate assistance plans	6	13
Inadequate implementation of assistance plans	21	17
Inadequate follow-up on assistance plans	20	22
Resistance on part of teachers to request SRC assistance	38	n.a
Lack of needed resources	33	18
N =	202	260

Table B-14

Percent of SRC members who cited the following as a problem:

Were any of the following problems resolved during the year?

	Yes
Scheduling meetings (n = 82)	73%
Resistance on part of teachers to request SRC assistance (n = 65)	22
Lack of needed resources (n = 55)	15

Table B-15

Source of Requests to SRC

Person Requesting Assistance	Percent of SRC Requests for Assistance
Classroom teacher	90%
Principal	1
Vice principal	2
Social worker	0
Psychologist	0
Speech language specialist	0
Nurse	<1
Guidance counselor	4
BSIP instructor	1
Physical education instructor	0
Supervisor of instruction	<1
Other	1
Total SRC requests	667

Source: SRC student data forms, 1989-90

Table B-16

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

What is the primary focus of your School Resource Committee's assistance plans for students with learning problems?

What is the primary focus of your SRC assistance plans for students with behavior problems?

	Learning Problems		Behavior Problems	
	SRC Member	Referring Staff	SRC Member	Refer Staff
Identifying alternative strategies/ mechanisms for the classroom teacher to assist the student (e.g., curricular and/or instructional alternatives).	63%	50%	62%	50%
Identifying additional services for the student to be provided by someone other than the student's classroom teacher (e.g., BSIP teacher, peer tutoring).	37	50	38	50
N =	208	238	211	209

Table B-17

Type of Assistance Recommended at First SRC Meeting (As Percent of Students Referred to SRC)

Type of Assistance	
Direct referral to CST	26%
Modifications in curriculum and/or instructional approaches	28
Behavior mgt. or modification	28
Study skills strategies	14
Modifications in class assigns., course requirements	16
Classroom organization or management strategies	9
Peer or non-staff tutoring	8
Teacher consultation with:	
Other classroom teachers	6
CST member	11
Parent	22
BSIP	4
Guidance personnel	10
Special educ. teacher	<1
Student referral to:	
Local instructional support program	11
Counselling in school	19
Community resources	11
Recommendation for screening/ testing other than by CST	11
Other	20
Total SRC Requests	667

Source: Data aggregated from SRC Student data forms

Table B-18

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

Overall, to what extent did the referring teachers [or did you] participate in the development and selection of the strategies listed in the SRC assistance plans?

	SRC Member	Refer Staff
Not at all	6%	19%
To some extent	35	41
To a considerable extent	59	40
N =	218	268

Table B-19

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

How would you characterize the role of the SRC?

	SRC Member	Refer Staff
Primarily a committee of specialists who provided recommendations to the referring teacher.	8%	12%
Primarily a committee engaged in problem-solving activities along with the referring teacher.	36	29
Both "1" and "2".	55	59
N =	217	258

Table B-20

Percent of SRC members responding:

Did your School Resource Committee encounter any of the following problems in having SRC assistance plans carried out?	Yes
Gaining the cooperation of the classroom teacher who requested assistance (n = 203)	17
Gaining the cooperation of other regular classroom teachers (n = 202)	11
Getting assistance from other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher) (n = 202)	6
Gaining access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL) (n = 200)	14
Gaining access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services) (n = 198)	18
Gaining the cooperation of parents (n = 202)	42
Gaining the cooperation of the student (n = 198)	39
Lack of support/leadership from the building administration (n = 202)	8
Difficulty with case monitoring (n = 196)	21

Table B-21

Percent of referring staff responding:

Did you encounter any of the following problems in implementing the SRC assistance plans this year?

	Yes
Insufficient familiarity with alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC (n = 250)	7%
Lack of assistance and/or training in implementing alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC (n = 247)	14
Gaining the cooperation of other regular classroom teachers (n = 245)	2
Getting assistance from other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher) (n = 249)	9
Gaining access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL) (n = 247)	9
Gaining access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services) (n = 233)	17
Gaining the cooperation of parents (n = 250)	37
Gaining the cooperation of the student (n = 246)	34
Lack of support/leadership from the building administration (n = 231)	10

Table B-22

Percent of SRC members responding:

Did any of the following factors facilitate the implementation of SRC assistance plans?

	Yes
The cooperation of the classroom teacher who requested assistance (n - 196)	91%
The cooperation of other regular classroom teachers (n - 196)	88
The cooperation of other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher) (n - 198)	90
Getting access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL) (n - 188)	82
Getting access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services) (n - 172)	69
The cooperation of parents (n - 186)	76
The cooperation of the student (n - 186)	81
Strong involvement/leadership by the principal and other building administrators (n - 192)	83
Effectiveness of case monitoring (n - 185)	80

Table B-23

Percent of referring staff responding:

Did any of the following factors facilitate the implementation of SRC assistance plans this year ?

	Yes
I was familiar with the alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC (n = 252)	90%
I received assistance and/or training in how to implement the alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC (n = 247)	51
The cooperation of other regular classroom teachers (n = 237)	80
The cooperation of other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher) (n = 249)	85
Getting access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL) (n = 235)	67
Getting access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services) (n = 232)	41
The cooperation of parents (n = 245)	66
The cooperation of the student (n = 241)	66
Strong involvement/leadership by the principal and other building administrators (n = 239)	72
Effectiveness of case monitoring (n = 222)	67

Table B-24

Disposition of SRC Cases, 1989-90

Disposition of Case	Percent of SRC Cases
Case still under auspices of SRC	36%
Problem was resolved	14
Student was referred to outside agency	2
Student was referred to Child Study Team;	
At first SRC meeting	26
At subsequent SRC meeting	12
Change was made in student's program	5
Student left district	3
Other reason	2
N =	656

Source: SRC student data forms, 1989-90

Table B-25

Timetable for SRC Meetings

Number of Weeks	Time Between Request for Assistance and Initial Meeting	Time Between Initial Meeting and First Follow-up	Time Between Initial Meeting and Disposition of Case *
0	3%	0%	23%
1	27	6	10
2	27	18	7
3	18	13	6
4	10	17	8
5	6	13	7
6	2	8	4
7	2	5	5
8	1	3	3
9	1	3	6
10 - 13	1	11	10
14 or more	1	3	10
N =	652	337	403

* Includes students referred to the Child Study Team at the first meeting. Does not include cases still under auspices of SRC.

Source: SRC student data forms, 1989-90

Table B-26

Percent of SRC members and referring staff responding:

Overall, how would you rate the performance of your School Resource Committee this year?

	SRC Member	Referring Staff
Excellent	24%	16%
Very Good	35	29
Good	25	26
Fair	11	19
Poor	5	11
N =	112	139

Table B-27

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

In your opinion, how has the SRC affected the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team? (n-113)[1]

Reduced the number of inappropriate referrals	77%
Has not changed the number of inappropriate referrals	21
Increased the number of inappropriate referrals	2

---

[1] Does not include 45 respondents on 29% of total cases who reported no basis for comparison.

Table B-28

Percent of SRC members, referring staff and other classroom teachers who did not access the SRC responding:

In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process helped to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team?

	SRC Members	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
To a considerable extent	30%	23%	16%
To some extent	50	35	23
Not at all	15	17	6
I don't know	6	25	54
N =	215	263	141

Table B-29

Percent of SRC members, referring staff and other classroom teachers who did not access the SRC responding:

In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process increased classroom teachers' repertoire of:

	SRC Members	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
Instructional Techniques			
To a considerable extent	18%	12%	12%
To some extent	64	52	36
Not at all	13	26	19
I don't know	5	11	33
N =	215	264	140
Behavioral Techniques			
To a considerable extent	29%	9	12
To some extent	63	54	36
Not al all	14	25	22
I don't know	4	13	29
N =	212	259	140

Table B-30

Percent of SRC members, referring staff and other classroom teachers who did not access the SRC responding:

In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process provided a way for faculty to share their expertise?

	SRC Members	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
To a considerable extent	45%	32%	23%
To some extent	45	45	36
Not at all	9	20	21
I don't know	1	4	21
N =	213	260	138

Table B-31

Percent of SRC members, referring staff and other classroom teachers who did not access the SRC responding:

In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process increased the capacity within regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problems?

	SRC Members	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
To a considerable extent	31%	24%	21%
To some extent	56	49	35
Not at all	11	20	14
I don't know	2	8	30
N =	214	262	136

Table B-32

Percent of referring staff responding:

To what extent did the SRC:

	Not at all	To some extent	considerable extent
Increase *your* repertoire of instructional techniques? (n - 258)	48%	47%	5%
Increase *your* repertoire of behavioral techniques? (n - 257)	47	49	5
Provide a way for faculty to share their expertise with *you*? (n - 255)	34	43	23
Increase *your* capacity to teach non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problem? (n - 256)	41	52	7
Facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance for the students with learning problems for whom you sought help? (n - 253)	25	53	23
Facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance for the students with behavior problems for whom you sought help? (n - 231)	29	56	15

Table B-33

Percent of SRC members responding:

In your opinion, does the SRC process facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance to those non-classified students with learning problems reviewed by the Committee? to those non-classified students with behavior problems? (n - 213)

	Learning Problems	Behavior Problems
The process does not facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance.	11%	10%
The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance somewhat.	61	64
The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance a great deal.	28	25

Table B-34

Percent of SRC members, referring staff and other classroom teachers who did not access the SRC responding:

In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process helped to serve students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education because their problems are not severe enough?

	SRC Members	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
To a considerable extent	35%	30%	19%
To some extent	49	40	34
Not all all	12	18	12
I don't know	4	12	35
N =	212	260	139

Table B-35

Percent of referring staff and other teachers responding:

How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the non-classified education students with learning or behavior problems in your classrooms? (n - 138)

	Referring Staff	Other Teachers
Not well at all	8%	5%
Somewhat well	29	25
Moderately well	47	48
Very well	17	22

Table B-36

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the assistance you receive for your non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems? (n = 134)

	1989-90		1987-88
	Referring Staff	Other Teachers	Classroom Teachers
Very dissatisfied	14%	8%	19%
Moderately dissatisfied	17	19	25
Moderately satisfied	47	50	46
Very satisfied	22	22	11

Table B-37

Percent of referring teachers responding:

Before your school had an SRC, from whom did you seek assistance when you had a non-classified student with learning problems? with behavior problems? (n = 260)

	Learning Problems	Behavior Problems
I did not seek assistance from other staff in my school or district	4%	4%
School-based assistance team	14	11
Child study team member	66	51
Special education teacher	39	21
Guidance counselor	42	40
Basic skills teacher	55	19
Other classroom teacher	55	54
ESL/bilingual education teacher	10	4
Building principal or assistant principal	65	77
Other administrator	9	11
Other	10	9

Table B-38

Percent of referring staff responding:

Compared to the time when your school did not have an SRC, how well are you meeting the needs of the non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems in your classroom? (n - 242)

Less well now	3%
About the same as before	50
Somewhat better now	35
Much better now	13

Table B-39

Percent of classroom teachers not using SRC responding:

Why did you not seek assistance from the School Resource Committee this year? (n = 142)

I did not have any students who required this type of assistance	50%
The wait for assistance is too long.	10
I didn't think the assistance would be useful.	13
I thought others would consider me a poor teacher.	0
Other sources of assistance were available.	18
I was not familiar with the process for requesting assistance	10
Other	23

Appendix C

Table C-1

IQ Tests

	L.D.	Psych.
Less frequently	11%	54%
As frequently	26	46
More frequently	9	0
Not applicable	54	0
	n = 35	39

Standardized Achievement Tests

	L.D.	Psych.
Less frequently	19%	18%
As frequently	62	21
More frequently	11	3
Not applicable	8	59
	n = 37	27

Perceptual Motor Tests

	L.D.	Psych.
Less frequently	74%	56%
As frequently	8	26
More frequently	0	0
Not applicable	18	18
	n = 39	39

Speech or Language Tests

	L.D.	Speech/lang Spec.
Less frequently	14%	11%
As frequently	33	53
More frequently	11	31
Not applicable	42	4
	n = 36	45

Table C-1 (Cont'd)

Personality or Affective Measures

	Psych.	Social Worker
Less frequently	33%	7%
As frequently	54	45
More frequently	13	16
Not applicable	0	32
n =	39	31

Parent Interviews

	L.D.	Psych.	Soc. Work	SLS	Total
Less frequently	6%	3%	13%	5%	6%
As frequently	58	47	74	53	57
More frequently	28	28	0	38	25
Not applicable	8	22	13	5	12
n =	36	36	31	40	143

Classroom Observations

	L.D.	Psych.	Soc. Work	SLS	Total
Less frequently	0%	3%	0%	2%	1%
As frequently	49	51	42	7	36
More frequently	46	46	45	86	57
Not applicable	5	0	13	5	5
n =	39	39	31	43	152

Records Review

	L.D.	Psych.	Soc. Work	SLS	Total
Less frequently	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
As frequently	72	68	53	27	55
More frequently	23	32	30	68	39
Not applicable	5	0	13	5	5
n =	39	38	30	41	148

Table C-1 (Cont'd)

Informal Skills Inventory

	L.D.	Psych.	Soc. Work	SLS	Total
Less frequently	0%	0%	7%	0%	1%
As frequently	51	33	30	46	41
More frequently	44	28	27	32	33
Not applicable	5	39	37	22	25
n =	39	39	30	41	149

Review of Work Samples

	L.D.	Psych.	Soc. Work	SLS	Total
Less frequently	0%	0%	7%	0%	1%
As frequently	54	41	40	37	43
More frequently	41	39	23	37	36
Not applicable	5	21	30	27	20
r =	39	39	30	41	149

Table C-2

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

To what degree do the results of functional assessment help you in making:

	Not at all	To some degree	To a considerable degree
Instructional recommendations (n = 153)	7%	43%	51%
Classification decisions (n = 151)	7	39	54
Placement decisions (n = 153)	8	33	59

Table C-3

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How helpful are Child Study Team reports under P2R compared to those produced in the years before P2R in:

	Less helpful now	About the same as before	More helpful now
Understanding the characteristics of my students (n = 255)	7%	62%	31%
Deciding what to teach (n = 256)	5	72	24
Deciding how to teach it (n = 256)	6	72	23

Table C-4

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How often do the evaluations contain the following:

	In all or most cases	In some cases	In few or no cases
A comprehensive medical exam (n - 158)	23%	38%	39%
Screening conducted by the school nurse (n - 159)	70	16	14
A review of the medical history by the school nurse (N- 159)	65	18	17
No medical information at all (n - 154)	3	6	91

Table C-5

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How often do you feel that the medical information you receive under P2R is sufficient to enable you to arrive at a classification decision? (n = 157)

In every or most cases.	61%
In some cases.	22
In a few or no cases.	27

Table C-6

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How often do you feel that the school nurse is appropriately involved in the evaluation and classification process under P2R? (n = 155)

In every or most cases.	48%
In some cases.	23
In a few or no cases.	30

Table C-7

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

In your opinion, how often do the eligibility criteria facilitate the appropriate assessment of students for special education? (n = 155)

All or most of the time	73%
Some or none of the time	27

Table C-8

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How often do the eligibility criteria identify the appropriate students for special education services? (n = 153)

All or most of the time	76%
Some or none of the time	24

Table C-9

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How professionally sound do you believe the eligibility criteria are for each of the following domain/impact areas?

	Not professionally sound	Basically professionally sound	Completely professionally sound
Cognitive (n - 147)	5%	70%	25%
Communication (n - 150)	5	77	17
Learning (n - 148)	6	72	22
Physical (n - 144)	6	65	29
Sensory (n - 142)	4	67	30
Social/emotional (n - 149)	11	73	15
Academic achievement (n - 148)	3	80	17
Behavior (n - 147)	12	75	14

Table C-10

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How would you compare the chances of a student receiving the same classification decision from two different Child Study Teams in your district now with the years prior to the implementation of P2R? (n = 113)[1]

The student is more likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under P2R.	54%
The student would be just as likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under the old system as under P2R.	32
The student is less likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under P2R.	14

---

[1] Does not include 45 respondents or 29% of total cases who reported no basis for comparison.

Table C-11

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How would you compare the severity of the problems of students referred to the child study team now with the severity of problems of students referred to the child study team prior to the implementation of P2R? (n = 116)[2]

Students referred now generally evidence more severe problems than those referred prior to P2R.	34%
Students referred now generally are similar to those referred prior to P2R in the severity of their problems.	65
Students referred now generally evidence less severe problems than those referred prior to P2R.	1

---

[2] 40 or 26% of total respondents indicated no basis for comparison

Table C-12

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

How would you compare the severity of handicap of students classified now by the child study team with the severity of handicap of students classified by the child study team prior to the implementation of P2R? (n = 114)[3]

Students classified now generally are more severely handicapped than those classified prior to P2R.	37%
Students classified now generally are similar to those classified prior to P2R in the severity of handicap.	62
Students classified now generally are less severely handicapped than those classified prior to P2R.	1

---

[3] 42 or 27% of respondents indicated no basis for comparison

Table C-13

Percent of Child Study Team members responding:

Under P2R, disability labels are no longer given to students. Instead, students are classified in one of three program classifications. How do you feel that this change has affected:

	Negatively	Not at all	Somewhat positively	Very positively
Students' self-perceptions (n = 152)	1%	53%	34%	12%
Parents' satisfaction with their child's classification (n = 155)	0	12	54	34
Your communication with parents (n = 154)	1	19	40	40
Your relations with regular education staff (n = 153)	4	56	32	9
Special education staff morale (n = 152)	8	51	33	8
Instructional planning for your class (n = 130)	5	52	29	14

Table C-14

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Under P2R, disability labels are no longer given to students. Instead, students are classified in one of three program classifications. How do you feel that this change has affected:.

	Negatively	Not at all	Somewhat positively	Very positively
Students' self-perceptions (n = 270)	2%	71%	21%	6%
Parents' satisfaction with their child's classification (n = 260)	1	36	51	12
Your communication with parents (n = 265)	1	66	26	7
Your relations with regular education staff (n = 266)	6	69	18	6
Special education staff morale (n = 266)	9	57	27	7
Instructional planning for your class (n = 269)	9	53	29	9
Education of handicapped students that you work with (n = 267)	5	55	29	11

Table C-15

Percent of parents responding:

What is your opinion of the current method of classifying students by program type (e.g., eligible for full-time special education services) as opposed to the old system of classifying students according to disability (e.g., emotionally disturbed, perceptually impaired)? (n = 889)[4]

I think the current classification system is better	55%
I think the old classification system was better	7
I think there is no difference	16
I don't know	23

---

[4] Does not include 18% of parents who indicated their child was not classified under the old system.

Table C-16

Percent of parents responding:

Has the new classification system helped you in talking with your child's teachers and/or case manager about your child? (n = 903)[5]

Yes	54%
No	28
I don't know	18

Table C-17

Percent of parents responding:

Has the new classification system made your child feel better about him/herself? (n = 899)[6]

Yes	53%
No	23
I don't know	24

---

[5] Does not include 16% of parents who indicated their child was not classified under the old system.

[6] Does not include 16% of parents who indicated their child was not classified under the old system.

Table C-18

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How often are your class profiles revised? (n - 142)

Quarterly	2%
Twice a year	5
Once a year	56
Less than once a year	1
I don't know	36

Table C-19

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Who revises the class profiles in your district? (n - 135)

Special education teachers	69%
Special education administrators	42
Training specialists	46
Child study team members	49
Others	5

Table C-20

Percent of child study team members responding:

How frequently have you used the class profiles for making placement decisions? (n = 147)

In every or most cases.	43%
In some cases.	15
In a few or no cases.	42

Table C-21

Percent of child study team members responding:

If you have not used the class profiles regularly for placing students in full-time programs, why not? (n = 113)

The profiles are not kept up-to-date.	8%
I know the characteristics of our full-time classes very well.	57
The profiles are not readily accessible.	13
We do not have any full-time classes.	4
Other	25

Table C-22

Percent of child study team members responding:

Listed below are the components of the class profile. For each component, indicate how valuable you feel the component has been in helping you to place students in full-time special education classes.

	No value	Some value	Considerable value
Program description (n = 137)	2%	36%	62%
Teacher certification (n = 135)	26	56	19
Actual age span (n = 138)	9	35	56
Actual class size (n = 138)	6	30	64
Required environmental adaptations (n = 133)	17	47	37
Required method of instructional delivery (n = 136)	9	40	52
Required related services (n = 137)	12	38	50
Specialized equipment for instruction (n = 135)	13	49	38
Specialized services (n = 135)	10	43	47
Curriculum areas/levels (n = 136)	5	28	67

Table C-23

Percent of child study team members responding:

If you were considering an out-of-district placement for one of your students, how useful would having class profiles from other districts be in making the placement decision? (n = 149)

Not useful	2%
Somewhat useful	22
Very useful	76

Table C-24

Percent of special education teachers responding:

To what degree does the class profile help you:

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent
Understand the characteristics of your students (n = 144)	9%	58%	33%
Understand the skill levels of your group (n = 144)	13	60	27
Clarify the general goals of your program (n = 144)	8	42	51
Understand the required environmental adaptations (n = 142)	21	46	33
Understand the method of instructional delivery (n = 144)	14	54	33
Understand the required related services (n = 143)	14	43	43
Understand the required specialized equipment for instruction (n = 142)	28	35	28
Understand the required specialized services (n = 142)	19	50	31
Plan instructional activities (n = 144)	22	47	31
Select instructional activities (n = 143)	20	52	29
Develop curricula for your class (n = 145)	13	51	36
Explain the program to parents (n = 143)	17	47	36

Table C-25

Percent of parents responding:

If your child is in a full-time special education class (e.g., learning disabled, moderate cognitive) did you see a "class profile," a description of your child's class? (n = 667)

Yes	62%
No	26
I don't know	12

Table C-26

Percent of parents responding:

If you saw a class profile, was the class as described appropriate for your child? (n = 414)

Very appropriate	67%
Somewhat appropriate	23
Not appropriate	3
I don't know	8

Table C-27

If you saw a class profile, is your child receiving all the services that are listed in the profile? (n = 403)

Yes	80%
No	5
I don't know	15

Table C-28

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How would you compare the grouping of your students according to their instructional needs now compared with the grouping of your students according to their instructional needs before the implementation of P2R? (n = 108)[7]

More appropriate	29%
About the same as before	60
Less appropriate	11

---

[7] 38 or 26% of respondents reported no basis for comparison.

Table C-29

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How would you compare the similarity among students in your classes now with the similarity among your students before the implementation of P2R on each of the following characteristics?[8]

	Less similar now	About the same as before	More similar now
Age (n = 124)	7%	74%	19%
Intelligence (n = 123)	10	69	21
Reading skill (n = 119)	13	65	23
Math skill (n = 112)	12	72	16
Behavior (n = 124)	12	67	21

---

[8] Does not include respondents who reported no basis for comparison.

Table C-30

Percent of special education teachers responding:

To what extent does the new P2R class structure accommodate the diversity of your students' instructional needs? (n - 137)

Very difficult to meet students' needs.	6%
Moderately difficult to meet students' needs.	22
Moderately able to meet students' needs.	45
Very able to meet students' needs.	27

Table C-31

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How many of the students in your program do you feel need the related services required for them by P2R? (n - 143)

All of the students	55%
Most of the students	24
Some of the students	17
Only a few of the students	3
None of the students	1

Table C-32

Percent of parents responding:

If your child's program has changed under P2R, what is your opinion of the changes? (n = 249)[9]

The current program is more appropriate for my child.	77%
The current program is less appropriate for my child.	7
There is no difference.	8
I don't know.	9

---

[9] Includes only those parents who indicated their child's program had changed under P2R.

Table C-33

Percent of resource center teachers and cooperating teachers responding:

Where in the classroom does special education instruction generally take place?

	Resource Center Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
Student's desk	88%	92%
Separate area from other students	40	28
Other	35	22
N =	58	95

Table C-34

Percent of resource center teachers and cooperating teachers responding:

What type of instructional approach do you generally use?

	Resource Center Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
One-to-one instruction	90%	96%
Small group instruction	78	48
Collaborative teaching	72	51
N =	58	95

Table C-35

Percent of resource center teachers and cooperating teachers responding:

What content area(s) do you support in-class?

	Resource Center Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
Reading	43%	49%
Language arts	52	46
Writing	38	36
Spelling	26	36
Mathematics	50	48
Science	55	36
Social studies	62	38
Other academic	12	7
Study skills	41	47
Help with homework	45	49
Other skills taught	19	20
N =	58	94

Table C-36

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Before the implementation of P2R, how would most of the mainstreamed handicapped students to whom you now provide in-class special education services have received support instruction? (n = 52)

Through the resource room	85%
Through supplemental instruction	4
No support would have been provided	12

Table C-37

Percent of resource center teachers and cooperating teachers responding:

Did you encounter any of the following problems in providing in-class special education services this year?

	Resource Center Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
Space/facilities in the classroom	41%	22%
Noise/other distractions in the classroom	38	40
Reluctance on the part of the classroom teacher	25	n.a.
Conflicts with the resource center teacher	n.a.	8
Scheduling	60	34
Lack of parental support	12	9
Reluctance on the part of the student(s)	30	19
Objections from other students	n.a.	8
Lack of consultation time	48	34
N =	58	93

Table C-38

Percent of cooperating teachers responding:

How does the resource center teacher provide consultation to you concerning your students who received in-class special education services this year? (n = 93)

Direct teacher contact	93%
Written correspondence	28
Mutual planning time	41
Other	10

Table C-39

Percent of cooperating teachers responding:

How satisfied are you with the amount of consultation time in your schedule? (n = 92)

Very dissatisfied	37%
Moderately dissatisfied	20
Moderately satisfied	19
Very satisfied	24

Table C-40

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Did any of the following factors facilitate your providing in-class services this year?

	Yes
Good working relationship with the classroom teacher(s) (n = 56)	93%
Building-level supervisory support of the program (n = 57)	84
Teacher involvement in planning of the program (n = 56)	77
Your involvement in planning of the program (n = 58)	90
Your prior experience with in-class teaching (n = 56)	77
The classroom teacher's prior experience with in-class services (n = 57)	51
In-service training (n = 48)	46

Table C-41

Percent of cooperating teachers responding:

Did any of the following factors facilitate the delivery of special education services in your classroom this year?

	Yes
Good working relationship with the in-class resource center teacher (n = 89)	92%
Building-level supervisory support of the program (n = 89)	73
Teacher involvement in planning of the program (n = 90)	66
Your involvement in planning of the program (n = 89)	63
Your prior experience with having other teachers in your classroom (n = 91)	59
The special education teacher's prior experience with in-class services (n = 89)	64
In-service training (n = 83)	33

Table C-42

Percent of special education teachers responding:

To what extent did the in-class services provided this year help your students to:[10]

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent
Improve their academic skills (n = 60)	2%	42%	57%
Improve their self-esteem (n = 60)	7	28	65
Improve their work habits (n = 62)	3	47	50
Improve their social skills (n = 57)	12	47	40
Improve their attendance (n = 49)	45	35	20
Improve their interactions with peers (n = 61)	12	51	38

---

[10] Does not include respondents who reported no basis for comparison.

Table C-43

Percent of referring teachers responding:

To what extent do the in-class services provided this year help your students to:

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent
Improve their academic skills (n = 93)	3%	33%	64%
Improve their self-esteem (n = 91)	3	41	56
Improve their work habits (n = 93)	9	37	55
Improve their social skills (n = 81)	17	48	35
Improve their attendance (n = 60)	28	38	33
Improve their interactions with peers (n = 81)	16	46	.38
Other			

Table C-44

Percent of resource center and cooperating teachers responding:

How many of the students for whom in-class instruction is provided appear able to keep up with the non-classified students in their classrooms?

	Resource Center Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
None	4%	4
Less than one half	14	14
About one half	15	15
More than one half, but not all	33	33
All	33	33
N =	57	93

Table C-45

Percent of parents responding:

How satisfied are you with having the special education services delivered in your child's regular classroom? (n = 180)

Very satisfied	69%
Somewhat satisfied	23
Somewhat or very dissatisfied	4
I don't know	3

Table C-46

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you this year with your experiences providing in-class special education services? (n = 58)

Somewhat or very dissatisfied	17%
Moderately satisfied	47
Very satisfied	36

Table C-47

Percent of cooperating teachers responding:

Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you this year with your experiences in having special education services delivered in your classroom? (n = 94)

Moderately or very dissatisfied	20
Moderately satisfied	32
Very satisfied	49

Table C-48

Percent of teachers responding:

How do you feel about the idea of another teacher instructing students within your classroom?

	1989-90		1987-88
	Coop. Teachers	Other Teachers	All Teachers
On the whole, I think it is a good idea.	76%	47%	48%
On the whole, I don't think it is a good idea.	16	34	40
I don't have any opinion.	8	19	12
N =	104	135	

Table C-49

Percent of other teachers responding:

Which of the following kinds of teachers, if any, have instructed students within your classroom? (n = 139)

Special education teacher	10%
Basic skills teacher	23
Supplemental instructor	12
Other regular classroom teachers	15
None	63

Table C-50

Percent of teachers responding:

How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom? (n = 110)

	Cooperating Teachers	Other Teachers
Not well at all	4%	9%
Somewhat well	15	20
Moderately well	48	43
Very well	34	27

Table C-51

Percent of cooperating teachers responding:

How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom now compared to the years prior to the implementation of P2R? (n = 100)

Not as well	5%
About the same	41
Somewhat better	28
Much better	26

Table C-52

Percent of teachers responding:

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you currently with the assistance you receive for the special education students in your classrooms?

	1989-90		1987-88
	Coop. Teachers	Other Teachers	All Teachers
Very dissatisfied	9%	14%	14%
Moderately dissatisfied	9	18	12
Moderately satisfied	29	46	44
Very satisfied	52	22	30
N =	109	83	206

Table C-53

L.D.

	Less	Same	More	NA	
Paperwork	n = 39	5%	15%	69%	10%
Testing	n = 39	41	46	3	10
Interview Parents	n = 38	13	37	26	24
Counsel Students	n = 37	8	16	22	54
Provide other related services	n = 36	3	25	16	56
Consulting with teachers	n = 39	3	31	59	8
Consulting with admin.	n = 38	0	34	58	8
Case Management	n = 38	0	26	63	11
SRC Membership	n = 36	8	6	64	22

Psychologist

	Less	Same	More	NA	
Paperwork	n = 38	5%	15%	69%	10%
Testing	n = 37	57	35	3	5
Interview Parents	n = 39	13	46	28	13
Counsel Students	n = 39	10	36	49	5
Provide other related services	n = 39	3	25	17	56
Consulting with teachers	n = 39	10	33	51	5
Consulting with admin.	n = 39	5	46	44	5
Case Management	n = 38	0	32	58	11
SRC Membership	n = 37	3	3	54	41

Social Worker

	Less	Same	More	NA	
Paperwork	n = 31	3%	0%	81%	16%
Interview Parents	n = 31	13	55	13	19
Counsel Students	n = 31	10	19	52	19
Provide other related services	n = 31	6	26	19	48

Table C-53 (Cont'd)

Consulting with teachers	n - 31	6	29	45	19
Consulting with admin.	n - 31	3	39	42	16
Case Management	n - 31	0	26	48	26
SRC Membership	n - 29	0	10	45	46

SLS

	Less	Same	More	NA	
Paperwork	n - 46	2%	7%	83%	9%
Testing	n - 46	11	26	50	13
Interview Parents	n - 45	4	40	36	20
Provide other related services	n - 46	28	46	15	11
Consulting with teachers	n - 46	4	37	50	9
Consulting with admin.	n - 45	4	33	47	16
Case Management	n - 44	4	11	52	32

Table C-54

Percent of special education teachers responding:

How would you compare the amount of time you spend now on the following activities with the time spent in the years before the implementation of P2R?[11]

	Less time	Same amount of time	More time
Teaching (n = 225)	11%	61%	28%
Instructional planning (n = 229)	4	47	49
Curriculum development (n = 208)	6	45	49
Paperwork (n = 226)	4	26	70
Communicating with parents (n = 225)	4	72	24
Advising students (n = 219)	4	61	35
Consulting with other teachers (n = 224)	5	47	49
Consulting with administrators (n = 228)	7	59	35
Consulting with child study team staff (n = 226)	5	44	51

---

[11] Does not include respondents who reported no basis for comparison.

Table C-55

Percent of special education teachers responding:

Overall, how would you compare the effectiveness of special education under P2R with the effectiveness of special education in the years before the implementation of P2R? (n = 228) [12]

Much more effective under P2R	15%
Somewhat more effective under P2R	41
The same as before	31
Somewhat less effective under P2R	9
Much less effective under P2R	4

---

[12] 43 or 16% of total respondents reported no basis for comparison.

Appendix D

DIRECTIONS: Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.

SCHOOL RESOURCE COMMITTEE MEMBER

1. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach? (Circle ONE)
    1. Elementary school
    2. Middle/junior high school
    3. High school

2. Which of the following best describes your position in your school? (Circle ONE)
    1. Principal
    2. Assistant principal
    3. Regular classroom teacher
    4. Child Study Team member
    5. Basic skills or remedial education teacher
    6. Bilingual/ESL teacher
    7. Guidance counselor
    8. School nurse
    9. Curriculum coordinator or supervisor of instruction
    10. Other (Specify): ______________________________

3. How many years have you held this position in this district?

    __ __ Years in this position in this district

4. How many years did you hold this position in another district(s)?

    __ __ Years in this position in another district(s)

5. Were you a member of a School Resource Committee last year (1988-89 school year?) (Circle ONE)
    1. No, I was not an SRC member last year.
    2. Yes, I was a member of the same SRC I now serve on.
    3. Yes, I was a member of a different SRC in this school.
    4. Yes, I was a member of an SRC in a different school in the same district.
    5. Yes, I was a member of an SRC in a different district.

6. About how many meetings of your School Resource Committee did you attend since September? Exclude training meetings. (Circle ONE)

    1. 0
    2. 1 - 4
    3. 5 - 10
    4. 11 - 15
    5. 16 - 20
    6. More than 20

7. When does your School Resource Committee usually meet? (Circle ONE)

    1. Before school
    2. During school hours
    3. After school
    4. We meet both during school hours and before and/or after school.

8. How long do your SRC meetings usually last? (Circle ONE)

    1. Less than 30 minutes
    2. 30 - 45 minutes
    3. 45 - 60 minutes
    4. More than one hour

9. Approximately how many students do you usually discuss at each meeting?

    _____ Number of students

10. Outside of meetings, about how much time do you typically spend each month on SRC activities? (Circle ONE)

    1. 0 hours
    2. 1-5 hours
    3. 6-10 hours
    4. More than 10 hours

11. How is your time at SRC meetings covered? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. No coverage is required.
    b. Another teacher covers my class.
    c. A substitute teacher covers my class.

12. How are you compensated for your attendance at SRC meetings? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. I receive monetary compensation.
    b. I receive compensatory time.
    c. I receive other compensation (Specify): ______________
    d. I do not receive any compensation.

13. Which of the following best describes the position of the person who usually chairs your School Resource Committee meetings? (Circle ONE)

    1. Principal
    2. Assistant principal
    3. Regular classroom teacher
    4. Child Study Team member
    5. Basic skills or remedial education teacher
    6. Bilingual/ESL teacher
    7. Guidance counselor
    8. School nurse
    9. Curriculum coordinator or supervisor of instruction
    10. Other (Specify): ______________________________

14. Which of the following procedures does your school use to notify parents of SRC actions? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. Parents are consulted by the referring staff member regarding the student's problem prior to a decision to refer to the SRC.

    b. Parents are notified of the Request for Assistance before a meeting is scheduled.

    c. Parents are notified of the Request for Assistance only after a meeting has been scheduled.

    d. Parents are sent a copy of the initial Assistance Plan.

    e. Parents are sent a copy of the Follow-up Plan(s).

    f. Parents are informed of any changes made to their child's program.

    g. Parents are invited to SRC meetings as observers.

    h. Parents are invited to participate in SRC meetings.

15. Did your School Resource Committee encounter any of the following problems this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
15a.	Scheduling meetings	1	2
15b.	Inconsistent attendance of SRC members at meetings	1	2
15c.	Coverage of classes	1	2
15d.	Compensation of SRC members	1	2
15e.	Not enough time to review cases	1	2
15f.	Inadequate screening of requests for assistance	1	2
15g.	Lack of agreement among SRC members on appropriate assistance options	1	2
15h.	Failure to formulate useful recommendations	1	2
15i.	Preparation of inappropriate assistance plans	1	2
15j.	Inadequate implementation of assistance plans	1	2
15k.	Inadequate follow-up on assistance plans	1	2
15l.	Resistance on part of teachers to request SRC assistance	1	2
15m.	Lack of needed resources	1	2
15n.	Other problems (Specify):______________________________		

16. Were any of the following problems resolved during the year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
16a.	Scheduling meetings	1	2
16b.	Inconsistent attendance of SRC members at meetings	1	2
16c.	Coverage of classes	1	2
16d.	Compensation of SRC members	1	2
16e.	Not enough time to review cases	1	2
16f.	Inadequate screening of requests for assistance	1	2
16g.	Lack of agreement among SRC members on appropriate assistance options	1	2
16h.	Failure to formulate useful recommendations	1	2
16i.	Preparation of inappropriate assistance plans	1	2
16j.	Inadequate implementation of assistance plans	1	2
16k.	Inadequate follow-up on assistance plans	1	2
16l.	Resistance on part of teachers to request SRC assistance	1	2
16m.	Lack of needed resources	1	2
16n.	Other problems (Specify):______________________________		

17. Overall, to what extent did the referring teachers participate in the development and selection of the strategies listed in the SRC assistance plans? (Circle only ONE)

    1. Not at all
    2. To some extent
    3. To a considerable extent

18. How would you characterize the role of the SRC? (Circle only ONE)

    1. Primarily a committee of specialists who provided recommendations to the referring teacher.

    2. Primarily a committee engaged in problem-solving activities along with the referring teacher.

    3. Both "1" and "2".

19. What is the primary focus of your School Resource Committee's assistance plans for students with learning problems? (Circle ONE)

    1. Identifying alternative strategies/mechanisms for the classroom teacher to assist the student (e.g., curricular and/or instructional alternatives).

    2. Identifying additional services for the student to be provided by someone other than the student's classroom teacher (e.g., BSIP teacher, peer tutoring).

20. What is the primary focus of your SRC assistance plans for students with behavior problems? (Circle ONE)

    1. Identifying alternative strategies/mechanisms for the classroom teacher to assist the student (e.g., behavior management or modification, classroom management techniques).

    2. Identifying additional services for the student to be provided by someone other than the student's classroom teacher (e.g., counseling services, community services).

21. Did your School Resource Committee encounter any of the following problems in having SRC assistance plans carried out? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
21a.	Gaining the cooperation of the classroom teacher who requested assistance	1	2
21b.	Gaining the cooperation of other regular classroom teachers	1	2
21c.	Getting assistance from other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher)	1	2
21d.	Gaining access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL)	1	2
21e.	Gaining access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services)	1	2
21f.	Gaining the cooperation of parents	1	2
21g.	Gaining the cooperation of the student	1	2
21h.	Lack of support/leadership from the building administration	1	2
21i.	Difficulty with case monitoring	1	2
21j.	Other problems (Specify):______________________________		

22. Did any of the following factors facilitate the implementation of SRC assistance plans? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
22a.	The cooperation of the classroom teacher who requested assistance	1	2
22b.	The cooperation of other regular classroom teachers	1	2
22c.	The cooperation of other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher)	1	2
22d.	Getting access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL)	1	2
22e.	Getting access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services)	1	2
22f.	The cooperation of parents	1	2
22g.	The cooperation of the student	1	2
22h.	Strong involvement/leadership by the principal and other building administrators	1	2
22i.	Effectiveness of case monitoring	1	2
22j.	Other factors (Specify):______________________________		

23. In your opinion, to what extent has the SRC process: (Circle ONE for each line)

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent	I don't know
23a. Helped to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team?	1	2	3	4
23b. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of instructional techniques?	1	2	3	4
23c. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of behavioral techniques?	1	2	3	4
23d. Provided a way for faculty to share their expertise?	1	2	3	4
23e. Increased the capacity within regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problems?	1	2	3	4
23f. Helped to serve students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education because their problems are not severe enough?	1	2	3	4

24. In your opinion, does the SRC process facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance to those non-classified students with learning problems reviewed by the Committee? (Circle ONE)

1. The process does not facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance.
2. The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance somewhat.
3. The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance a great deal.

25. In your opinion, does the SRC process facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance to those non-classified students with behavior problems reviewed by the Committee? (Circle ONE)

1. The process does not facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance.
2. The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance somewhat.
3. The process facilitates the provision of appropriate assistance a great deal.

26. How often do you feel that the medical and health information you receive is sufficient for making SRC decisions? (Circle ONE)

    1. In all cases
    2. In most cases
    3. In some cases
    4. In a few cases
    5. In no cases

27. How often do you feel that the school nurse is appropriately involved in providing information for SRC decisions?

    1. In all cases
    2. In most cases
    3. In some cases
    4. In a few cases
    5. In no cases

28. Overall, how would you rate the performance of your School Resource Committee this year? (Circle ONE)

    1. Excellent
    2. Very Good
    3. Good
    4. Fair
    5. Poor

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Use this space or the back of this page to add any comments or concerns you have about the functioning of the School Resource Committee in your school.

DIRECTIONS: **Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.**

SCHOOL RESOURCE COMMITTEE FUNCTIONING

1. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach? (Circle ONE)

    1. Elementary school
    2. Middle/junior high school
    3. High school

2. Which of the following best describes your position in your school? (Circle ONE)

    1. Principal
    2. Assistant principal
    3. Regular classroom teacher
    4. Child Study Team member
    5. Basic skills or remedial education teacher
    6. Bilingual/ESL teacher
    7. Guidance counselor
    8. School nurse
    9. Curriculum coordinator or supervisor of instruction
    10. Other (Specify): ______________________________

3. How many years have you held this position in this district?

    __ __ Years in this position in this district

4. How many years did you hold this position in another district(s)?

    __ __ Years in this position in another district(s)

5. Did you request assistance from the SRC last year (1988-89 school year) for any of your students? (Circle ONE)

    1. No
    2. Yes

6. Approximately how many non-classified students in your class(es) this year (1989-90) have learning and/or behavior problems?

    __ __ Number of students

7. In this school year (1989-90), how many students did you request assistance for from the SRC?

__ __ Number of students referred to the SRC

8. Of those students you referred to the SRC this school year, how many had learning problems?

__ __ Number of students with learning problems

9. Of those students you referred to the SRC this school year, how many had behavior problems?

__ __ Number of students with behavior problems

10. How is your time at SRC meetings covered? (Circle ALL that apply)

a. No coverage is required.
b. Another teacher covers my class.
c. A substitute teacher covers my class.

11. Overall, to what extent did you participate in the development and selection of the strategies listed in the SRC assistance plans? (Circle only ONE)

1. Not at all
2. To some extent
3. To a considerable extent

12. How would you characterize the role of the SRC? (Circle only ONE)

1. Primarily a committee of specialists who provided recommendations to me.

2. Primarily a committee engaged in problem-solving activities with me.

3. Both "1" and "2".

13. Did you have any of the following problems with the School Resource Committee this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
13a.	Scheduling meetings	1	2
13b.	Coverage of your classes to attend SRC meetings	1	2
13c.	Lack of agreement among SRC members on appropriate assistance options	1	2
13d.	Failure to formulate useful recommendations	1	2
13e.	Preparation of inappropriate assistance plans	1	2
13f.	Inadequate implementation of assistance plans	1	2
13g.	Inadequate follow-up on assistance plans	1	2
13h.	Lack of needed resources	1	2
13i.	Other problems (Specify):________________________		

14. What was the primary focus of the School Resource Committee's assistance plans for your students with learning problems? (Circle only ONE)

1. Identifying alternative strategies/mechanisms for you to assist the student (e.g., curricular and/or instructional alternatives)

2. Identifying additional services for the student to be provided by someone other than yourself (e.g., BSIP teacher, peer tutoring)

15. What was the primary focus of the School Resource Committee's assistance plans for your students with behavior problems? (Circle only ONE)

1. Identifying alternative strategies/mechanisms for you to assist the student (e.g., behavior management or modification, classroom management techniques)

2. Identifying additional services for the student to be provided by someone other than yourself (e.g., counseling services, community services)

16. Did you encounter any of the following problems in implementing the SRC assistance plans this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
16a.	Insufficient familiarity with alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC	1	2
16b.	Lack of assistance and/or training in implementing alternative strategies/ mechanisms recommended by SRC	1	2
16c.	Gaining the cooperation of other regular classroom teachers	1	2
16d.	Getting assistance from other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher)	1	2
16e.	Gaining access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL)	1	2
16f.	Gaining access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services)	1	2
16g.	Gaining the cooperation of parents	1	2
16h.	Gaining the cooperation of the student	1	2
16i.	Lack of support/leadership from the building administration	1	2
16j.	Other problems (Specify):________________________		

17. Did any of the following factors facilitate the implementation of SRC assistance plans this year ? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
17a.	I was familiar with the alternative strategies/mechanisms recommended by SRC	1	2
17b.	I received assistance and/or training in how to implement the alternative strategies/ mechanisms recommended by SRC	1	2
17c.	The cooperation of other regular classroom teachers	1	2
17d.	The cooperation of other school staff (e.g., school nurse, guidance personnel, remedial education teacher)	1	2
17e.	Getting access to other educational programs in the school (e.g., BSIP, bilingual/ESL)	1	2
17f.	Getting access to programs outside your school (e.g., community services)	1	2
17g.	The cooperation of parents	1	2
17h.	The cooperation of the student	1	2
17i.	Strong involvement/leadership by the principal and other building administrators	1	2
17j.	Effectiveness of case monitoring	1	2
17k.	Other factors (Specify):________________________		

18. To what extent did the SRC: (Circle ONE for each line)

		Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent
18a.	Increase your repertoire of instructional techniques?	1	2	3
18b.	Increase your repertoire of behavioral techniques?	1	2	3
18c.	Provide a way for faculty to share their expertise with you?	1	2	3
18d.	Increase your capacity to teach non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problem?	1	2	3
18e.	Facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance for the students with learning problems for whom you sought help?	1	2	3
18f.	Facilitate the provision of appropriate assistance for the students with behavior problems for whom you sought help?	1	2	3

19. Did you request assistance for any pupils whom you would not consider referring to the Child Study Team?

1. Yes
2 No

20. If yes, how many students?

___________ Number of students

21. Before your school had an SRC, from whom did you seek assistance when you had a non-classified student with learning problems? (Circle ALL that apply)

a. I did not seek assistance from other staff in my school or district
b. School-based assistance team
c. Child study team member
d. Special education teacher
e. Guidance counselor
f. Basic skills teacher
g. Other classroom teacher
h. ESL/bilingual education teacher
i. Building principal or assistant principal
j. Other administrator
k. Other (Specify) ____________________________

22. Before your school had an SRC, from whom did you seek assistance when you had a non-classified student with behavior problems? (Circle ALL that apply)

a. I did not seek assistance from other staff in my school or district
b. School-based assistance team
c. Child study team member
d. Special education teacher
e. Guidance counselor
f. Basic skills teacher
g. Other classroom teacher
h. ESL/bilingual education teacher
i. Building principal or assistant principal
j. Other administrator
k. Other (Specify) ______________________________

23. In your opinion to what extent has the SRC process generally: (Circle ONE for each line)

	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Considerable Extent	I Don't Know
23a. Helped to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team?	1	2	3	4
23b. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of instructional techniques?	1	2	3	4
23c. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of behavioral techniques?	1	2	3	4
23d. Provided a way for faculty to share their expertise?	1	2	3	4
23e. Increased the capacity within regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problems?	1	2	3	4
23f. Helped to serve students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education because their problems are not severe enough?	1	2	3	4

24. Overall, how would you rate the performance of the School Resource Committee this year? (Circle ONE)

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

25. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you currently with the assistance you receive for your non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems? (Circle ONE)

 1. Very dissatisfied
 2. Moderately dissatisfied
 3. Moderately satisfied
 4. Very satisfied

26. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems in your classrooms? (Circle ONE)

 1. Not well at all
 2. Somewhat well
 3. Moderately well
 4. Very well

27. Compared to the time when your school did not have an SRC, how well are you meeting the needs of the non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems in your classroom? (Circle ONE)

 1. Less well now
 2. About the same as before
 3. Somewhat better now
 4. Much better now

28. Do you have any special education students in your class(es) this year? (Circle ONE)

 1. Yes.....................GO TO QUESTION #29
 2. No.....................GO TO THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
 3. I don't know..........GO TO THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

29. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you currently with the assistance you receive for the special education students in your classes? (Circle ONE)

 1. Very dissatisfied
 2. Moderately dissatisfied
 3. Moderately satisfied
 4. Very satisfied

30. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom? (Circle ONE)

 1. Not well at all
 2. Somewhat well
 3. Moderately well
 4. Very well

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Use this space or the back of this page to add any comments or concerns you have about the functioning of the School Resource Committee in your school.

DIRECTIONS: Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER

1. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach? (Circle ONE)

   1. Elementary school
   2. Middle/junior high school
   3. High school

2. How many students do you serve in total?

   __ __ Total number of students served

3. How many of your students receive more than two periods or two hours of special education instruction?

   __ __ Number of students

4. Which of the following best describes the special education program in which you teach? (Circle ONE)

   1. Full-time:preschool................Go to Question #5
   2. Full-time: learning disabilities...Go to Question #5
   3. Full-time: other handicapping condition....................Go to Question #5
   4. Departmentalized..................Go to Question #9
   5. Resource center....................Go to Question #13

5. How would you compare the grouping of your students according to their instructional needs now compared with the grouping of your students according to their instructional needs before the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

   1. More appropriate
   2. About the same as before
   3. Less appropriate
   4. No basis for comparison

6. How would you compare the similarity among students in your classes now with the similarity among your students before the implementation of P2R on each of the following characteristics? (Circle ONE on each line)

	Less similar now	About the same as before	More similar now	No basis for comparison
6a. Age	1	2	3	4
6b. Intelligence	1	2	3	4
6c. Reading skill	1	2	3	4
6d. Math skill	1	2	3	4
6e. Behavior	1	2	3	4

7. To what extent does the new P2R class structure accommodate the diversity of your students' instructional needs? (Circle ONE)

   1. Very difficult to meet students' needs.
   2. Moderately difficult to meet students' needs.
   3. Moderately able to meet students' needs.
   4. Very able to meet students' needs.

8. How many of the students in your program do you feel need the related services required for them by P2R? (Circle ONE)

   1. All of the students
   2. Most of the students
   3. Some of the students
   4. Only a few of the students
   5. None of the students

Questions #9 - #12 ask about the use of the class profile.

9. Has a class profile been prepared for your class(es)?

   1. Yes...............Go to Question #10
   2. No................Go to Question #13

10. To what degree does the class profile help you: (Circle ONE on each line)

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent
10a. Understand the characteristics of your students	1	2	3
10b. Understand the skill levels of your group	1	2	3
10c. Clarify the general goals of your program	1	2	3
10d. Understand the required environmental adaptations	1	2	3
10e. Understand the method of instructional delivery	1	2	3
10f. Understand the required related services	1	2	3
10g. Understand the required specialized equipment for instruction	1	2	3
10h. Understand the required specialized services	1	2	3
10i. Plan instructional activities	1	2	3
10j. Select instructional activities	1	2	3
10k. Develop curricula for your class	1	2	3
10l. Explain the program to parents	1	2	3

11. How often are your class profiles revised? (Circle ONE)

1. Quarterly
2. Twice a year
3. Once a year
4. Less than once a year
5. I don't know

12. Who revises the class profiles in your district? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. Special education teachers
    b. Special education administrators
    c. Training specialists
    d. Child study team members
    e. Others (Specify)________________________________

Questions #13 - #16 ask questions about other changes under P2R.

13. Under P2R, disability labels are no longer given to students. Instead, students are classified in one of three program classifications. How do you feel that this change has affected: (Circle ONE on each line)

		Very negatively	Somewhat negatively	Not at all	Somewhat positively	Very positively
13a.	Students' self-perceptions	1	2	3	4	5
13b.	Parents' satisfaction with their child's classification	1	2	3	4	5
13c.	Your communication with parents	1	2	3	4	5
13d.	Your relations with regular education staff	1	2	3	4	5
13e.	Special education staff morale	1	2	3	4	5
13f.	Instructional planning for your class	1	2	3	4	5
13g.	Education of handicapped students that you work with	1	2	3	4	5

14. How helpful are Child Study Team reports under P2R compared to those produced in the years before P2R in: (Circle ONE on each line)

	Less helpful now	About the same as before	More helpful now
14a. Understanding the characteristics of my students	1	2	3
14b. Deciding what to teach	1	2	3
14c. Deciding how to teach it	1	2	3

15. How would you compare the amount of time you spend now on the following activities with the time spent in the years before the implementation of P2R?

	I spend a lot less time now	I spend somewhat less time now	I spend the same amount of time as before	I spend somewhat more now	I spend a lot more time now	Not applicable or no basis for comparison
15a. Teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6
15b. Instructional planning	1	2	3	4	5	6
15c. Curriculum development	1	2	3	4	5	6
15d. Paperwork	1	2	3	4	5	6
15e. Communicating with parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
15f. Advising students	1	2	3	4	5	6
15g. Consulting with other teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
15h. Consulting with administrators	1	2	3	4	5	6
15i. Consulting with child study team staff	1	2	3	4	5	6

15j. Other (Specify):

____

16. Overall, how would you compare the effectiveness of special education under P2R with the effectiveness of special education in the years before the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

    1. Much more effective under P2R
    2. Somewhat more effective under P2R
    3. The same as before
    4. Somewhat less effective under P2R
    5. Much less effective under P2R
    6. No basis for comparison

17. Do you provide special education services in the students' regular classrooms (in-class services)? (Circle ONE)

    1. Yes..........Go to Question #18
    2. No...........You do not need to complete the remainder of the questionnaire. Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Please use the space on the last page to add any additional comments that would help us understand how changes made under P2R have affected you and your students.

Questions #18 - 33 ask about in-class special education services.

18. For how many students (total) do you provide in-class special education services?

    ____ Number of students

19. Approximately how many periods or hours a week do you provide in-class special education services? (Answer only ONE)

    ____ Number of periods

    ____ Number of hours

20. In how many different classes do you provide in-class special education services?

    ____ Number of classes

21. What is the largest number of students you serve in a period?

    ____ Largest number of students

22. What is the smallest number of students you serve in a period?

    ____ Smallest number of students

23. Where in the classroom does special education instruction generally take place? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. Student's desk
    b. Separate area from other students
    c. Other (Specify): ____________________

24. What type of instructional approach do you generally use? (Circle ALL that apply.)

    a. One-to-one instruction
    b. Small group instruction
    c. Collaborative teaching

25. What content area(s) do you support in-class? (Circle ALL that apply.)

    a. Reading
    b. Language arts
    c. Writing
    d. Spelling
    e. Mathematics
    f. Science
    g. Social studies
    h. Other academic (Specify): ________________________
    i. Study skills
    j. Help with homework
    k. Other skills taught

26. How many of the students for whom you provide in-class instruction appear able to keep up with the non-classified students in their classrooms? (Circle ONE)

    1. None
    2. Less than one half
    3. About one half
    4. More than one half, but not all
    5. All

27. Before the implementation of P2R, how would most of the mainstreamed handicapped students to whom you now provide in-class special education services have received support instruction? (Circle ONE)

    1. Through the resource room
    2. Through supplemental instruction
    3. No support would have been provided

28. To what extent did the in-class services provided this year help your students to: (Circle ONE on each line)

		Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent	Not applicable
28a.	Improve their academic skills	1	2	3	4
28b.	Improve their self-esteem	1	2	3	4
28c.	Improve their work habits	1	2	3	4
28d.	Improve their social skills	1	2	3	4
28e.	Improve their attendance	1	2	3	4
28f.	Improve their interactions with peers	1	2	3	4
28g.	Other (Specify): ____________________				

29. Do you ever work with non-classified students when you deliver in-class services?

1. Yes
2. No

30. Of the total time you devote to in-class services, about what percent is spent in each of the following activities? (Your allocations should sum to 100%).

________% Instruction

________% Planning

________% Consultation with the classroom teacher

________% Other (Specify)____________________

31. Did you encounter any of the following problems in providing in-class special education services this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

	Yes	No
31a. Space/facilities in the classroom	1	2
31b. Noise/other distractions in the classroom	1	2
31c. Reluctance on the part of the classroom teacher	1	2
31d. Scheduling	1	2
31e. Lack of parental support	1	2
31f. Reluctance on the part of the student(s)	1	2
31g. Lack of consultation time	1	2
31h. Other (Specify): ______________________________		

32. Did any of the following factors facilitate your providing in-class services this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

	Yes	No
32a. Good working relationship with the classroom teacher(s)	1	2
32b. Building-level supervisory support of the program	1	2
32c. Teacher involvement in planning of the program	1	2
32d. Your involvement in planning of the program	1	2
32e. Your prior experience with in-class teaching	1	2
32f. The classroom teacher's prior experience with in-class services	1	2
32g. In-service training	1	2
32h. Other (Specify): ________________________________		

33. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you this year with your experiences providing in-class special education services? (Circle ONE)

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Moderately satisfied
4. Very satisfied

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Use this space or the back of this page to add any additional comments or concerns you have about P2R.

DIRECTIONS: Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: A

1. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach? (Circle ONE)

   1. Elementary school
   2. Middle/junior high school
   3. High school

2. How many years have you taught in this district?

   __ __ Years in this district

3. How many years did you teach in another district(s)?

   __ __ Years in another district(s)

4. What is the major way your classroom is organized? (Circle ONE)

   1. Self-contained class--I teach the same students all or a significant part of the day.

   2. Team-teaching--I teach the same students all or a significant part of the day with another teacher.

   3. Departmentalized situation--I teach several classes of different students during the day.

5. Approximately how many special education students do you have in total in your classes this year?

   _____ Total number of special education students

6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you currently with the assistance you receive for the special education students in your classrooms? (Circle ONE)

   1. Very dissatisfied

   2. Moderately dissatisfied

   3. Moderately satisfied

   4. Very satisfied

7. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom? (Circle ONE)

   1. Not well at all
   2. Somewhat well
   3. Moderately well
   4. Very well

8. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom now compared to the years prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

   1. Not as well
   2. About the same
   3. Somewhat better
   4. Much better

9. Does a resource center teacher deliver special education services in your classroom?

   1. Yes (Go to question #10)
   2. No (Go to question #29)

Questions #10-28 ask about the kinds of services special education students receive in your classroom.

10. How many of your students receive special education services in your classroom?

    _____ Number of students

11. How many periods or hours a week does a resource center teacher provide special education services in your classroom? (Answer ONE)

    _____ Number of periods

    _____ Number of hours

12. How many different resource center teachers provide special education services in your classroom?

    _____ Number of resource center teachers

13. What is the largest number of students who receive special education services in your classroom in a period?

    _____ Largest number of students

14. What is the smallest number of students who receive special education services in your classroom in a period?

_____ Smallest number of students

15. Where in your classroom does special education instruction usually take place? (Circle ALL that apply.)

a. Student's desk
b. Separate area from other students
c. Other (Specify): ____________________

16. What type of instructional approach does the resource center teacher usually use in your classroom? (Circle ALL that apply.)

a. One-to-one instruction
b. Small group instruction
c. Collaborative teaching

17. What content area(s) do the resource center teachers cover? (Circle ALL that apply.)

a. Reading
b. Language arts
c. Writing
d. Spelling
e. Mathematics
f. Science
g. Social studies
h. Other academic (Specify): ________________________
i. Study skills
j. Help with homework
k. Other skills taught

18. How many of the students for whom in-class instruction is provided appear able to keep up with the non-classified students in their classrooms? (Circle ONE)

1. None
2. Less than one half
3. About one half
4. More than one half, but not all
5. All

19. To what extent do the in-class services provided this year help your students to: (Circle ONE on each line)

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent	Not applicable
19a. Improve their academic skills	1	2	3	4
19b. Improve their self-esteem	1	2	3	4
19c. Improve their work habits	1	2	3	4
19d. Improve their social skills	1	2	3	4
19e. Improve their attendance	1	2	3	4
19f. Improve their interactions with peers	1	2	3	4
19g. Other (Specify): ______________________________				

20. Do the resource center teachers ever work with non-classified students when they deliver in-class services in your classroom?

1. Yes
2. No

21. Before this year, which of the following kinds of teachers, if any, had instructed students within your classroom? (Circle ALL that apply.)

a. Special education teacher
b. Basic skills teacher
c. Supplemental instructor
d. Other regular classroom teacher
e. Other (Specify): _______________
f. None

22. Did you encounter any of the following problems in having special education services provided in your classroom this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
22a.	Space/facilities in the classroom	1	2
22b.	Noise/other distractions in the classroom	1	2
22c.	Scheduling	1	2
22d.	Lack of parental support	1	2
22e.	Conflicts with the resource center teacher	1	2
22f.	Reluctance on the part of the student(s) being served	1	2
22g.	Objections from other students	1	2
22h.	Lack of consultation time	1	2
22i.	Other (Specify): ______________________________		

23. Did any of the following factors facilitate the delivery of special education services in your classroom this year? (Circle ONE on each line)

		Yes	No
23a.	Good working relationship with the in-class resource center teacher	1	2
23b.	Building-level supervisory support of the program	1	2
23c.	Teacher involvement in planning of the program	1	2
23d.	Your involvement in planning of the program	1	2
23e.	Your prior experience with having other teachers in your classroom	1	2
23f.	The special education teacher's prior experience with in-class services	1	2
23g.	In-service training	1	2
23h.	Other (Specify): ______________________________		

24. Did the resource center teacher provide consultation to you concerning your students who received in-class special education services this year? (Circle ONE)

1. Yes (Go to Question #25)
2. No (Go to Question #28)

25. Are you provided specific consultation time in your schedule? (Circle ONE)

1. Yes
2. No

26. How satisfied are you with the amount of consultation time in your schedule? (Circle ONE)

    1. Very dissatisfied
    2. Moderately dissatisfied
    3. Moderately satisfied
    4. Very satisfied

27. How does the resource center teacher provide consultation to you concerning your students who received in-class special education services this year? (Circle ALL that apply.)

    a. Direct teacher contact
    b. Written correspondence
    c. Mutual planning time
    d. Other (Specify): ______________________________

28. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you this year with your experiences in having special education services delivered in your classroom? (Circle ONE)

    1. Very dissatisfied
    2. Moderately dissatisfied
    3. Moderately satisfied
    4. Very satisfied

29. How do you feel about the idea of another teacher instructing students within your classroom? (Circle ONE)

    1. On the whole, I think it is a good idea.
    2. On the whole, I don't think it is a good idea.
    3. I don't have any opinion.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please use the remaining space or the back of this page to add any comments or concerns you have about the delivery of special education services in the regular classroom setting.

DIRECTIONS: Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: B

1. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach? (Circle ONE)

    1. Elementary school
    2. Middle/junior high school
    3. High school

2. How many years have you taught in this district?

    __ __ Years in this district

3. How many years did you teach in another district(s)?

    __ __ Years in another district(s)

4. What is the major way your classroom is organized? (Circle ONE)

    1. Self-contained class--I teach the same students all or a significant part of the day.

    2. Team-teaching--I teach the same students all or a significant part of the day with another teacher.

    3. Departmentalized situation--I teach several classes of different students during the day.

5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the assistance you receive for your non-classified students with learning and/or behavior problems? (Circle ONE)

    1. Very dissatisfied
    2. Moderately dissatisfied
    3. Moderately satisfied
    4. Very satisfied

6. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the non-classified education students with learning or behavior problems in your classrooms? (Circle ONE)

   1. Not well at all
   2. Somewhat well
   3. Moderately well
   4. Very well

7. What kinds of assistance or information would be helpful to you in instructing non-classified students with learning or behavior problems? (Circle ALL that apply)

   a. Instructional materials
   b. Instructional strategies
   c. Behavioral techniques
   d. Diagnostic information
   e. Suggestions for outside assistance
   f. Other (Specify): ____________________
   g. Not applicable

8. In your opinion, to what extent has the School Resource Committee process: (Circle ONE for each line)

	Not at all	To some extent	To a considerable extent	I don't know
8a. Helped to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team?	1	2	3	4
8b. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of instructional techniques?	1	2	3	4
8c. Increased classroom teachers' repertoire of behavioral techniques?	1	2	3	4
8d. Provided a way for faculty to share their expertise?	1	2	3	4
8e. Increased the capacity within regular education to serve non-handicapped students with learning and/or behavior problems?	1	2	3	4
8f. Helped to serve students who would not have been appropriately placed in special education because their problems are not severe enough?	1	2	3	4

9. Did you submit a Request for Assistance this year to the School Resource Committee?

1. Yes
2. No

10. Why did you not seek assistance from the School Resource Committee this year? (Circle ALL that apply)

a. I did not have any students who required this type of assistance.
b. The wait for assistance is too long.
c. I didn't think the assistance would be useful.
d. I thought others would consider me a poor teacher.
e. Other sources of assistance were available.
f. I was not familiar with the process for requesting assistance
g. Other (Specify) ____________________________________

11. Do you have any special education students in your class(es) this year?

    1. Yes............ Go to Question #12
    2. No............. Go to Question #14

12. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you currently with the assistance you receive for the special education students in your classrooms? (Circle ONE)

    1. Very dissatisfied
    2. Moderately dissatisfied
    3. Moderately satisfied
    4. Very satisfied

13. How well do you feel you are meeting the needs of the special education students in your classroom? (Circle ONE)

    1. Not well at all
    2. Somewhat well
    3. Moderately well
    4. Very well

14. Which of the following kinds of teachers, if any, have instructed students within your classroom? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. Special education teacher
    b. Basic skills teacher
    c. Supplemental instructor
    d. Other regular classroom teachers
    e. None

15. How do you feel about the idea of another teacher instructing students within your classroom? (Circle ONE)

    1. On the whole, I think it is a good idea.
    2. On the whole, I don't think it is a good idea.
    3. I don't have any opinion.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Use this space or another piece of paper to add any comments or concerns you have about the effect of the Plan to Revise Special Education on you and your students.

DIRECTIONS: Please follow the directions carefully. Some questions ask you to fill in a number. Some questions ask you to circle only ONE response. Other questions ask you to circle ALL responses that apply.

CHILD STUDY TEAM MEMBER

1. What is your position on the Child Study Team? (Circle ONE)

   1. Learning disabilities teacher consultant
   2. Psychologist
   3. Social worker
   4. Speech/language specialist

2. How many years have you held this position in this district?

   __ __ Years in this position in this district

3. How many years did you hold this position in another district(s)?

   __ __ Years in this position in another district(s)

Question #4 asks about referrals to the Child Study Team.

4. In your opinion, how has the SRC affected the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team? (Circle ONE)

   1. Reduced the number of inappropriate referrals
   2. Has not changed the number of inappropriate referrals
   3. Increased the number of inappropriate referrals
   4. No basis for comparison

Questions #5 - 13 ask about the evaluation and classification of students referred to your Child Study Team.

5. How often do you use the following types of measures now as compared with the year(s) prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE on each line.)

	Less frequently now	As frequently as before	More frequently now	Not applicable
5a. IQ tests (e.g., WISC-R)	1	2	3	4
5b. Standardized achievement tests (e.g., PIAT, WRAT)	1	2	3	4
5c. Perceptual motor tests	1	2	3	4
5d. Speech or language tests	1	2	3	4
5e. Personality/affective measures	1	2	3	4
5f. Parent interviews	1	2	3	4
5g. Classroom observation	1	2	3	4
5h. Records review	1	2	3	4
5i. Informal skills inventories	1	2	3	4
5j. Review of work samples	1	2	3	4

6. To what degree do the results of functional assessment help you in making: (Circle ONE on each line)

	Not at all	To some degree	To a considerable degree
6a. Instructional recommendations	1	2	3
6b. Classification decisions	1	2	3
6c. Placement decisions	1	2	3

7. In your opinion, how often do the eligibility criteria facilitate the appropriate assessment of students for special education? (Circle ONE)

   1. All of the time
   2. Most of the time
   3. Some of the time
   4. None of the time

8. How often do the eligibility criteria identify the appropriate students for special education services?

   1. All of the time
   2. Most of the time
   3. Some of the time
   4. None of the time

9. How professionally sound do you believe the eligibility criteria are for each of the following domain/impact areas? (Circle ONE on each line.)

	Not professionally sound	Basically professionally sound	Completely professionally sound
9a. Cognitive	1	2	3
9b. Communication	1	2	3
9c. Learning	1	2	3
9d. Physical	1	2	3
9e. Sensory	1	2	3
9f. Social/emotional	1	2	3
9g. Academic achievement	1	2	3
9h. Behavior	1	2	3

10. How often do the evaluations contain the following: (Circle ONE on each line)

	In every case	In most but not all cases	In some cases	In a few cases	In no cases
10a. A comprehensive medical exam	1	2	3	4	5
10b. Screening conducted by the school nurse	1	2	3	4	5
10c. A review of the medical history by the school nurse	1	2	3	4	5
10d. No medical information at all	1	2	3	4	5

10e. Other (Specify) ________________

11. How often do you feel that the medical information you receive under P2R is sufficient to enable you to arrive at a classification decision? (Circle ONE)

    1. In every case.
    2. In most but not all cases.
    3. In some cases.
    4. In a few cases.
    5. In no cases.

12. How often do you feel that the school nurse is appropriately involved in the evaluation and classification process under P2R?

    1. In every case.
    2. In most but not all cases.
    3. In some cases.
    4. In a few cases.
    5. In no cases.

13. How would you compare the chances of a student receiving the same classification decision from two different Child Study Teams in your district now with the years prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

    1. The student is more likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under P2R.

    2. The student would be just as likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under the old system as under P2R.

    3. The student is less likely to receive the same classification decision from both teams under P2R.

    4. I have no basis for comparison.

Questions #14-17 ask about the use of class profiles for placing students in full-time special education classes.

14. How frequently have you used the class profiles for making placement decisions? (Circle ONE)

    1. In every case.
    2. In most but not all cases.
    3. In some cases.
    4. In a few cases.
    5. In no cases.

15. If you have not used the class profiles regularly for placing students in full-time programs, why not? (Circle ALL that apply)

    a. The profiles are not kept up-to-date.
    b. I know the characteristics of our full-time classes very well.
    c. The profiles are not readily accessible
    d. We do not have any full-time classes
    e. Other (Please specify)____________________

16. Listed below are the components of the class profile. For each component, indicate how valuable you feel the component has been in helping you to place students in full-time special education classes. (Circle ONE on each line.)

	No value	Some value	Considerable value
16a. Program description	1	2	3
16b. Teacher certification	1	2	3
16c. Actual age span	1	2	3
16d. Actual class size	1	2	3
16e. Required environmental adaptations	1	2	3
16f. Required method of instructional delivery	1	2	3
16g. Required related services	1	2	3
16h. Specialized equipment for instruction	1	2	3
16i. Specialized services	1	2	3
16j. Curriculum areas/levels	1	2	3

17. If you were considering an out-of-district placement for one of your students, how useful would having class profiles from other districts be in making the placement decision? (Circle ONE)

    1. Not useful
    2. Somewhat useful
    3. Very useful

Questions # 18 - 19 ask you about the characteristics of students referred to and classified by the Child Study Team under P2R.

18. How would you compare the severity of the problems of students referred to the child study team now with the severity of problems of students referred to the child study team prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

    1. Students referred now generally evidence more severe problems than those referred prior to P2R.

    2. Students referred now generally are similar to those referred prior to P2R in the severity of their problems.

    3. Students referred now generally evidence less severe problems than those referred prior to P2R.

    4. I have no basis for comparison.

19. How would you compare the severity of handicap of students classified now by the child study team with the severity of handicap of students classified by the child study team prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE)

    1. Students classified now generally are more severely handicapped than those classified prior to P2R.

    2. Students classified now generally are similar to those classified prior to P2R in the severity of handicap.

    3. Students classified now generally are less severely handicapped than those classified prior to P2R.

    4. I have no basis for comparison.

Questions #20 - #22 ask questions about other changes under P2R.

20. Under P2R, disability labels are no longer given to students. Instead, students are classified in one of three program classifications. How do you feel that this change has affected: (Circle ONE on each line)

	Very negatively	Somethat negatively	Not at all	Somewhat positively	Very positively
20a. Students' self-perceptions	1	2	3	4	5
20b. Parents' satisfaction with their child's classification	1	2	3	4	5
20c. Your communication with parents	1	2	3	4	5
20d. Your relations with regular education staff	1	2	3	4	5
20e. Special education staff morale	1	2	3	4	5
20f. Instructional planning for your class	1	2	3	4	5

21. How frequently does the speech/language specialist participate in the following Child Study Team activities? (Circle ONE on each line)

	In every case	In most but not all cases	In some cases	In a few cases	In no cases
21a. Evaluation planning	1	2	3	4	5
21b. Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
21c. Classification and placement	1	2	3	4	5
21d. Case management	1	2	3	4	5

22. How would you compare the amount of time you spend now on the following activities with the time you spent prior to the implementation of P2R? (Circle ONE on each line)

		I spend a lot less time now	I spend somewhat less time now	I spend the same amount of time as before	I spend somewhat more time now	I spend a lot more time now	Not applicable or no basis for comparison
22a.	Paperwork	1	2	3	4	5	6
22b.	Testing	1	2	3	4	5	6
22c.	Interviewing parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
22d.	Counseling students	1	2	3	4	5	6
22e.	Providing speech services	1	2	3	4	5	6
22f.	Providing other related services	1	2	3	4	5	6
22g.	Consulting with teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
22h.	Consulting with administrators	1	2	3	4	5	6
22i.	Case management	1	2	3	4	5	6
22j.	SRC membership	1	2	3	4	5	6

22k. Other (Specify):

____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Use this space or the back of this page to add any additional comments or concerns you have about P2R.

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete all questions as directed, by circling the appropriate letter(s) or number.

1. What kind of special education program or service does your child currently receive? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

   A. Full-time special education class (in a separate room or departmentalized program)

   B. Part-time program (resource room, where the child leaves the regular classroom to work with a special education teacher for less than half the day, or in-class services, where a special ed teacher provides suppport in the regular classroom)

   C. Speech services

   D. Other related services (e.g., counseling, physical therapy, occupational therapy, etc.)

   E. I don't know

2. How old is your child? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

   1. Five years or younger

   2. Between 6 and 10 years

   3. Between 11 and 13 years

   4. 14 years or older

3. How long has your child received special education services? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

   1. Two years or less

   2. Three years or more

4. If your child is in a full-time special education class, (e.g., learning disabled; moderate cognitive) did you see a "class profile," a description of your child's class?

   1. Yes

   2. No

   3. I don't know

   4. My child is not in a full-time program

5. If you saw a class profile, was the class as described appropriate for your child? (ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU SAW A CLASS PROFILE).

    1. Very appropriate
    2. Somewhat appropriate
    3. Not appropriate
    4. I don't know

6. If you saw a class profile, is your child receiving all the services that are listed in the profile? (ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU SAW A CLASS PROFILE)

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know

7. What is your opinion of the current method of classifying students by program type (e.g., eligible for full-time special education services) as opposed to the old system of classifying students according to disability (e.g., emotionally disturbed, perceptually impaired)?

    1. I think the current classification system is better
    2. I think the old classification system was better
    3. I think there is no difference
    4. My child was not classified under the old system
    5. I don't know

8. Has the new classification system helped you in talking with your child's teachers and/or case manager about your child?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. My child was not classified under the old system
    4. I don't know

9. Has the new classification system made your child feel better about him/herself?

    1. Yes

    2. No

    3. My child was not classified under the old system

    4. I don't know

10. Has your child's educational program changed under the Plan to Revise Special Education (P2R)?

    1. Yes

    2. No

    3. My child was not classified under the old system

    4. I don't know

11. If your child's program has changed under P2R, what is your opinion of the changes? (ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU BELIEVE YOUR CHILD'S PROGRAM HAS CHANGED.)

    1. The current program is more appropriate for my child

    2. The current program is less appropriate for my child

    3. There is no difference

    4. My child was not classified under the old system

    5. I don't know

12. Does a special education teacher go into the regular classroom to help your child? (ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOUR CHILD IS IN A PART-TIME PROGRAM.)

    1. Yes

    2. No

    3. I don't know

13. How satisfied are you with having the special education services delivered in your child's regular classroom? (ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 12.)

    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. Somewhat dissatisfied
    4. Very dissatisfied
    5. I don't know

14. If you have any questions or concerns about the Plan to Revise Special Education (P2R), please write them in the space below or on the reverse side of this paper.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE